

stay on the road. In that case, you would have to pay your board, or be looked after in that way. You would have to provide rest houses for your men and engine houses for your engines. Every company would have its engine houses and its rest houses, and every one of its trains would have to lie over after it had gone as far as it could in a day, until it rested and was ready to go on again the next day. Would not that be a very comfortable way of conducting the railway business of the country? You could not do that, you say; that would be absurd. Well, what else would you do? There would have to be some authority in charge, which would have spare locomotives and spare men whom you could utilize to look after and repair them at every 120 or 140 miles along this railway. Then, that thing would have to be repeated all over the line. Why is that not done now? Because it is utterly impracticable. The only practicable way is to have some railway commission or some general tribunal deal with the matter. When different railways are anxious to use a road in common, they constitute themselves into a board, which board appoints its officers and employs its men, who will have general supervision over the common road so as to ensure its equitable use to all. This association would have to own the locomotives and manage everything in order to ensure fair play. But such a body could not operate a transcontinental line running its trains three thousand miles to the Pacific coast. Right of way is sometimes given by one railway to another over its line, but only for short distances. The Canadian Pacific Railway use the Grand Trunk Railway between Toronto and Hamilton. But that is a very short mileage; and when you talk of giving various railways the use of a line a thousand miles long, the thing is not possible. A common railway highway is not feasible. You cannot work out any such idea. The idea is however put forward, as one of the great merits of this scheme, that it will provide a common railway highway which may be used by all the railway companies that may desire to connect with this line across to the prairies. It is claimed that all these other companies may send their trains over it. That, Sir, can never be worked out. There are good reasons why the latter feature of this scheme, involving the leasing of this road to a private corporation, will defeat the possibility of this road being utilized to any extent by any other company doing business in the western country. The same reasons which would justify the construction of this road by the government call for its operation by the government. There is no other way in which the advantages which are supposed to accrue from government ownership can accrue to the people. When I speak of government ownership, I do not necessarily mean the operation of the road by the

Railway Department. It does not matter a jot whether the road be in the control of a department of the government or some tribunal which the government may create, it must be operated by an independent tribunal which has no interest in any other railways that are competing for the same traffic. Therefore I say that when the government took the responsibility of building this line, it should also have taken the responsibility of owning and operating it. It should not have parted with it for a period of fifty years. Its leasing of it for fifty years is equivalent to their giving up its ownership during that period. It ought to own the road and operate it, and in this way confer on the country the advantages, whether great or small which follow from government ownership. The people would then enjoy those advantages which they will not do now under the system adopted. After going to the enormous expenditure of building this line, the government intend handing it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for fifty years. Thus during two generations this property will be out of their hands. But they say, 'Oh, we have put some very binding clauses in the contract, we have tied them up hand and foot, we have compelled them by agreement to do this thing and the other. That does not help the government in the least. I do not say that these restrictions will be of no advantage at all, but I say that there will be no advantage to the people from the construction of the road, after you once lease it, commensurate with the loss incurred by your parting with its control and putting the road into other hands. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is not in a position to attract a great deal of business to this road. If the tendencies were all, as my hon. friend thinks they are or will be, in favour of this road securing transatlantic traffic with equal advantage compared with any water route, when the government lease it to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, they give it into the absolute operating control of that company. You can not constitute any committee of investigation able to watch those men close enough to prevent their giving the advantages to their own company's traffic in preference to any other. No ingenuity you can display will enable you to provide yourself with safeguards sufficient to prevent the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from giving the benefits and advantages to themselves and with holding them from others. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is practical owner. Every man engaged on that road will be in their employ, looking to them for wages and promotion, and anxious to win the confidence and goodwill of his employers. Every train despatcher, along this strip of 1,800 or 1,900 miles, will be naturally inclined to favour the company which pays him. It will be of the greatest importance to him to see that no delay occurs in the despatching of their trains