

ties when he himself, in 1914 and again in 1916, strongly urged on this House that the property should be acquired through the acquisition of the stock and that the value of the stock should be determined by arbitration?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I dislike to interrupt my right hon. friend, but he is entirely in error when he says that I strongly urged upon the House the desirability of taking over the property by arbitration. What I did say in 1914 was this: I urged that as a condition of guaranteeing the \$45,000,000, the stock should be reduced to \$30,000,000 and placed in trust for a period of five years so that if there was default the Government could at once take control of the property. If, on the other hand, the company pulled through for five years, then Parliament would have the right, if it chose to do so, to take the property at a valuation not exceeding \$30,000,000. That is a very different thing.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is only another of the remarkable misapprehensions under which my hon. friend is labouring in regard to this Bill. I am really at a loss to account for them. On the second day of June, 1914, as I have already pointed out to this House, my hon. friend seconded this resolution and spoke strongly in favour of it:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved that under existing circumstances no assistance should be given to the Canadian Northern Railway company unless at the same time it is provided that the Government have power, within a reasonable time to acquire the ownership of the entire stock of the company at a price to be fixed by arbitration, but not to exceed thirty million dollars.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If my right hon. friend will pardon my interrupting him again, may I ask him if he has read the resolution that I myself moved a short time before that?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am reading the resolution which the hon. gentleman seconded and in support of which he spoke very strongly. I have not the slightest objection to any interruption that my hon. friend may see fit to make; in fact, the more he interrupts me, the better I am pleased. There is his proposal; it was moved by his leader and supported by him in a strong speech. I reminded him on the 14th day of August of what he had said in support of that resolution, but I will venture to trespass upon the time of the House by reading his remarks again, not so much for the benefit of the House—as,

I imagine, every other hon. gentleman remembers it—as for the benefit of my hon. friend himself, who seems to have forgotten it. Here is what he said:

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moves as an amendment that as a condition of granting this aid the Government shall be allowed to take control of this stock and control of the enterprise until it is completed, and that the country shall have leave to take over the entire stock of the Canadian Northern railway within a reasonable time at a price to be fixed by arbitration but not to exceed the sum of \$30,000,000. Is not that a reasonable proposition? Is not that a proposition which is fair to the people of this country who are called upon to assume this enormous liability? Is it not fair to Mackenzie, Mann and Company who are asking this country, for the fourth time, to help to complete this enterprise? It is fair to Mackenzie, Mann & Company, and it is a fair and reasonable proposition on behalf of the people of this country.

My hon. friend has forgotten to-day what he said in 1914, but when we came to Parliament with a proposal on this subject in 1916, my hon. friend had a most vivid memory of what he had proposed in 1914, referred to it in terms of appreciation and commendation, and said that he was prepared to stand for the same thing at that time. He will agree that under the circumstances the extraordinary misunderstandings under which he seems to labour with regard to the proposal now before the House must detract from the authority which his words on ordinary occasions command in this House.

I shall take up in a moment the real point of my hon. friend's amendment. But first I should like to observe in that connection that if it is so obvious a proposition as he has described it, it is a remarkable thing that it never occurred to him either in 1914 or in 1916. But it is a still more astonishing thing that during all the time this proposal has been before Parliament during the present session it never occurred to him until the moment when he arose to address the House half an hour ago.

What is our proposal? Our proposal is that we should appoint a Board of Arbitrators precisely in accordance with the method which he himself proposed in 1914 in the motion which I have read—according to the mode which in 1916 he declared to be eminently in the public interest. But he now proposes that after appointing a Board of Arbitrators to make an award which shall be subject to an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, and after the Board of Arbitrators and the Supreme Court of Canada have