

he would indeed be ungrateful if he were not the ardent Imperialist that I am.

Now, why am I opposed to public ownership? That is the question. Private enterprise is based on individualism; public ownership on Communism. Take our Canadian National Railways for instance. If that is not an example of Communism, tell me what Communism is. Under Communism we should all be equal and all initiative would be destroyed. If all were equal, who would want to study? Who would want to work when the lazy man and the lubber would be on the same footing as every other man? I am opposed to Communism because it is an absurd system. It has never worked and never can work; nevertheless, we seem to be approaching it very rapidly just now. I am surprised at this. In days long gone by, my family flirted a little with the old Tory party, but I never thought the day would come when I should see such things as I see now. From listening to the radio one would get the impression that the Tory party is headed towards Communism. It is doing all sorts of things to-day that it was opposed to in the past. For instance, we actually have our national brother-in-law in Washington advocating reciprocity, although I still have ringing in my ears the words, "No truck nor trade with the Yankees. Let well enough alone, Wilfrid Laurier." What do we hear to-day? "Let bad enough alone, R. B. Bennett. Let bad enough alone."

If all were equal, of course there would be no profit. Public ownership takes away all hope of gain. Basically, it is a false, reactionary and dangerous doctrine. We hear the cry: "Ruin the millionaire. Do away with capitalism." Well, honourable gentlemen, who is going to pay the wages if there is no more capital? That is a question you must think about. If there is no more capital there will be no more wages for anybody. In Russia there are no wages, if that is what you want. There, instead of wages you are given a ticket, and with it perhaps you can get a loaf of bread, or a pound of butter, which costs \$2. I do not know whether honourable gentlemen have read in the paper of the return of a certain man to Sault Ste. Marie. He was inclined to be a Communist. He went to Russia and stayed a couple of years. Then he said, "The wages are very good, but no matter how good they are you have to pay \$2 for a pound of butter, and there is no hope of getting on." So he came back to Sault Ste. Marie, and as he was a good worker he got his old job back and now he is done with Russia.

I will point out some of the misdeeds of public ownership. The province of Quebec is fortunate, because it got bitten early. The Quebec Government got the bright idea of building a railroad from Quebec City to Ottawa and putting Montreal on a side-track. The railroad was built at a cost of \$14,000,000. I see the honourable senator from Grandville (Hon. Mr. Chapais) smiling. He remembers what took place and what scandals were connected with the affair. That was public ownership. Why was that line run straight from Quebec to Ottawa, with Montreal on a siding? I do not know whether this House has ever heard it, but the explanation was, nothing but politics. The Hon. Rodrigue Masson was the member from Terrebonne at Ottawa, and Hon. J. A. Chapeau was Prime Minister of the province. They wanted the railroad to pass near the manor-house of the Masson family, and so the railway ran down to St. Vincent de Paul on its way to Ottawa. There was a siding to Montreal running down to Rivière des Prairies, then up over the summit of Ile Jésus, then down to the Back river, then up again to the summit of the Island of Montreal, and finally down to Place Viger station. It was a regular scenic railway. Yet, as I pointed out to Mr. Fullerton, the road could have been run on a water level grade from Montreal to Quebec. Trains are still being run up and down those steep grades, as they have been for fifty years, all on account of politics. That is one example of public ownership. It happened to be a Conservative Government which was responsible in this case.

When people are determined to get a thing they will not listen to reason. That Quebec railroad could never be made to pay, but the Government went ahead with it. They lost money on it every year, and then there was tremendous pressure brought to bear on the Canadian Pacific, which was forced to buy it for \$7,000,000. As I have said, the road cost \$14,000,000. All this may be ancient history, but public ownership was no better fifty years ago than it is to-day. The railroad had previously been sold to L. A. Senecal, who thought he was going to make a lot of money out of it. Hon. T. Chase Casgrain made a fight about that incident, but it went through just the same. Senecal could not make it pay, as it was a political affair, and the Canadian Pacific took it.

On that deal the province of Quebec lost \$7,000,000, but it was a blessing in disguise. Just as a child who gets its fingers burnt on a red hot furnace stays away from the fire