

The hon. member says that we were responsible for the loan to the Canadian Northern. Every cent of the loan of 1911 went into the property, and the same is true of the loan of 1914. We did not want to take the baby; the government did everything it could to get rid of it. Not until everybody in Canada was sick and tired of putting up funds for private companies were the lines taken over. Is it not better, if we have to spend money in connection with foolish and improper undertakings, that we should at least know where every cent is going? Is it not better that if they are a success the country should get the benefit of it? Is it not better that the Canadian taxpayer should, to use a commonplace expression, get a "run for his money"?

Well, we are to blame for another thing, the hon. member says; we are to blame because the government consented to arbitration. I will tell the House very frankly that my own view as expressed in the report to which reference has been made was that there was no equity in the Canadian Northern. I took that view, and I still hold it. But the government were in this position: they were entering into possession of a property, and the usual thing when governments in civilized countries enter into possession of somebody else's property is to have a free and independent arbitration for the purpose of finding out what that property is worth. The usual course, therefore, was followed in this case: three independent arbitrators were appointed. I have not heard any attack made by hon. gentlemen opposite upon the character, the standing, or the ability of any one of these arbitrators; nevertheless we are blamed because we carried out an award made by a board composed of men of the highest standing.

Then, we are frightfully to blame, the hon. member suggests, because we did not know that the Grand Trunk had an American mileage. Is it not a tremendous discovery which the hon. gentleman has just made—that the Grand Trunk has an American mileage? Well, my hon. friends will have no difficulty in carrying out the project if they approach it along the lines of the report which has been made. That does not call for government operation as talked about by the hon. member for Picou. It does not mean that this Government will report to or take orders from the Washington government. It simply means that company operation will be carried on

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

in respect of the lines in American territory and reports made to the Washington authorities with regard thereto by that company. The only difference is that company would be owned not by private, English shareholders but by the people of Canada generally. I do not see anything sinister in this. I am sure that so far all the trouble in this regard has been manufactured by my hon. friends. If they stick to it long enough; if they talk about it loud enough, I dare say they may find a sympathetic reception on the part of some across the border, but if there is trouble, the country will know how and whence it came. Is there any trouble in connection with the ownership of the Soo line by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? Why, the Soo line gets along just as well to-day, owned by Canadians, as it did when owned by Americans. It is the same old company; reports are made in the ordinary course, and there is no trouble. The Michigan Central running through Ontario has no trouble in Canada, nor have I heard of any difficulties arising in connection with Mr. Hill's lines in the West. I have never heard any civilized country say that simply because the whole of a people of a very friendly neighbouring country are interested in an enterprise operating partly in their territory, the people of that neighbouring country shall do no business with them. But in the minds of these gentlemen who approach the subject with so much sympathy, this circumstance is a terrible bugaboo. I only hope that what I have heard is true: that a fair chance will be given national ownership.

But I wonder who is reading the situation most correctly? The Montreal Star has had an editorial upon the subject,—and the Montreal Star and Montreal Gazette are two papers referred to by my hon. friend from Marquette as being strangely sympathetic with the new administration. As to these papers we have the suggestion coming from governmental benches—yes, from an old member of standing—the suggestion of loaves and fishes. It is certainly a suggestion I would not make. Yet one hon. gentleman made it. I wonder why. I wonder what kind of a loaf and what kind of a fish that is. I wonder what kind of a monogram it would have upon it. I do not think any hon. gentleman on this side of the House at any rate, yes, or on the other, would have much difficulty in guessing what cabalistic lettering would appear upon them. Well, the idea of the Montreal