

a good political pull would get his freight hauled cheaper, and would get free passage for himself and his friends, and whatever the railroads lost in this respect would have to be made up out of the public chest, and eventually it would all come out of the farmers. Therefore, I say I do not believe that it would be a good principle to adopt. The government should control, in every possible way, the railroads under a good and efficient railroad commission, who would put into force any regulations that are introduced in their charters. But as for the government owning the railroads themselves, the thing is simply a farce. Look at the Intercolonial Railway, and the money that has been spent there. Why, it has paid no interest on the bonds. It has been run at a loss. It has been run chiefly by the late government as a political machine, as a means of enabling them to capture votes in the lower provinces. That road has cost some \$50,000,000, and though it may have been of some accommodation to the people on the line, it has chiefly been used during the regime of the Conservative government as to help keep themselves in power. It has never paid any profit, except that I think last year there was a small surplus of \$64,000. Just imagine \$64,000 income on an expenditure of \$50,000,000. Still, in view of all these facts, the hon. gentleman gets up now, on the eve of an election, and because he thinks a few people in the country believe in it, he goes back on all his record, as can be shown from the *Hansard*, from time to time, and tells us that he believes in adopting the principle of government ownership. So far as I am concerned, I do not believe in the principle, and can not vote for it, when applied only to this piece of road.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would point out to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), who says it will prevent this company from floating their bonds, if this legislation is carried, that, on the contrary, it will help them to float their bonds. It will be considered as a good proposition that the parliament of this country should reserve the right to take the road over some day should it see fit. I have only to point to this fact that the present government, a short time ago, put certain conditions on the Crow's Nest proposition, and yet that in no way interfered with the floating of the bonds under which the road was built. There would have been, in a measure, a breach of faith on the part of the member for Kent, if he had agreed to accept this proposition and then had withdrawn that acceptance. But, he is not the only delinquent; I say that the delinquents are the government. They pledged themselves some time ago, that, in any railway proposition that controlled a portage, or an important link in the solution of the transportation problem, they would ask parliament to make provi-

sion to retain control over such road. Now, they have gone back on that. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), speaking here the other evening, expressed himself as being altogether opposed to the principle of the government ownership of railways, and the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) seems to-day to control the government policy in regard to railways. They laid down the policy in the Crow's Nest Pass Railway agreement, that running rights should be given to other roads, and they said: We have retained the right to this country to control that railway. They laid down a similar policy in regard to the Rainy River Railway. How far that legislation secures control of that railway to the country I do not know, but I know that the government have gone to the people and claimed credit for it. Here is another important link between Toronto and Collingwood, and the most important link of all. Instead of carrying out the policy that they have laid down, the government have allowed the hon. member for Kent to dictate a policy to them, and in this they are delinquent to the pledges they gave to the people in regard to these portage railways. This is an important link in the railway system of this country, and it ought to be kept under the control of parliament. In connection with the question of government ownership of railways, which was condemned so strongly by the previous speaker, I would like to point out that in every country where government ownership has been adopted, the people do not desire to end it, but they desire to continue it. They are retaining and extending the control of public railways wherever the principle has been adopted. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) said that if you take up the question of government ownership, you must take it up as a general question and apply it to every railway in the country. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman, but, on the contrary, I say that we should take up each railway as it presents itself to our consideration, from time to time, and I say that the real solution is this: The government ought to retain control of the Intercolonial Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway should be extended through Ontario, to the Niagara and Detroit Rivers, and to Georgian Bay. The Intercolonial Railway can be made a paying road. If it is extended into Ontario, to the Georgian Bay and to the Niagara and Detroit Rivers, it will have more freight than it can possibly get now, because it ends nowhere. In addition to this, you can connect it with a line of steamers carrying produce from the North-west Territories at a small expense. This is the solution of the railway question in this country, and it does not involve any great expense. We would then have a government system and a paying line from ocean to ocean. That is the only way that relief will come.