

party inaugurated in 1878, this country has found its own market; it has found a market in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe; it stands to-day in its own strength; it does not feel itself at the mercy of the United States, notwithstanding the declaration of my right hon. friend; and it will continue to stand in its own strength and increase in its own strength in the future. And if the government of the day is actuated by the feeling and principles which inspired the establishment of the national policy of this country in 1878, it need not fear from the United States or any other country commercial bondage, political bondage or bondage of any kind. And the right hon. gentleman was somewhat plaintive with regard to the attitude of the United States of America toward this country. That is in marked contrast with the good old days, when, I think, delegates were sent to Washington for the purpose of inspiring American statesmen with the idea that they could much better negotiate with Canada if the Liberal party came into power, and when we were told from one end of the country to the other that the difficulty in the way of making an arrangement with the United States was the unreasonable attitude taken by the leaders of the Conservative party. The right hon. gentleman has changed his views with regard to all this. He does not sing those old songs of long ago, but frankly admits to us that in dealing with the United States of America we are dealing with a people who want—as is very natural—to get the best of the bargain, and who, on all occasions when they negotiate with Canada or any other nation will see to it that their rights and privileges are not neglected. Now, so much for the somewhat discursive observations of the right hon. gentleman this afternoon.

As to the scheme itself, I can only deal with it in its main, general aspects, because it was only handed to me at the conclusion of the Prime Minister's speech. But there are one or two salient points with regard to it which stand out in bold relief and to which I will bring the attention of the House and the country.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it has put back for fifty years, at least, the prospect of government ownership of railways in this country. Now, I do not declare myself to-day as absolutely in favour of government ownership of railways, although I know that there is a strong sentiment in this country in favour of that idea. But I say that it is not a wise policy, it is not a prudent policy for the government, looking to the developments of the future, to embark upon a scheme which absolutely puts that policy out of sight for the next fifty years, and this the government has certainly done, for it proposes to build a railway from the city of Moncton to the city of Winnipeg and to

hand that railway over to the Grand Trunk Pacific for fifty years at least. That line from Moncton to Winnipeg is described by the right hon. gentleman as the key to the whole western situation. If it be true that it is the key to the whole western situation, the handing of it over in this way places beyond the power of the government for the next fifty years any policy of government ownership of railways.

In the second place, Mr. Speaker, it enables the Grand Trunk Railway Company to practically control the Intercolonial Railway. There is no doubt about that. It looks as if it were intended to result in the eventual ownership by the Grand Trunk Railway of the Intercolonial Railway. How is it to be done? Lines of steamships are to be established on the Atlantic and the Pacific to be operated by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I suppose that on the Atlantic they will sail from the ports of Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John. How are these steamships to be operated unless the Grand Trunk shall secure running powers over the Intercolonial Railway from Moncton to Halifax? And when it secures these running powers, or even without them, what becomes of the Intercolonial Railway? It is virtually placed within the power of the Grand Trunk Railway, and that railway will be in a position to dictate the policy of the Intercolonial Railway and regulate its mode of dealing with traffic. Further than that, it practically converts the Intercolonial Railway, a road upon which we have expended nearly \$70,000,000, if I recollect correctly into a local road. Certainly it converts it into a local road so far as that portion of its line from Quebec to Moncton is concerned. And, while my right hon. friend, in speaking here to-day, was inclined to minimize that aspect of the question, nevertheless, he, in effect, admitted that, so far as those portions of the provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec traversed by the Intercolonial Railway are concerned, the building of this new line must be detrimental to these localities.

But there is a more important matter in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and that is that the policy brought down to-day is an absolute and complete reversal of the policy upon which this government embarked four or five years ago. And I will show you why. In 1898—I think it was—the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) brought down a proposal to this House to acquire a line of railway from Lévis to the city of Montreal. That proposal eventually passed this House and became law. Under it the government of this country paid for the Drummond County Railway the sum of \$1,600,000, that being the capital representing the annual payment of \$64,000 for ninety-nine years. In addition, the government has spent upon that line no less a sum than \$500,000. So,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).