

unite with him in his opinion. He may possibly have reasons for holding these views; but there is no just reason why this Bill should be crippled when other companies have been chartered without this limitation to their privileges. I am struck with the bitter, determined opposition of the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) to this Bill. In the Railway Committee he was on his feet nearly the whole time it was before the committee, and as soon as the third reading is proposed here, he makes a long speech. I think I can see the reason for it. No doubt he hopes, if returned to power, to transfer his Chignecto Ship Railway from Nova Scotia and lay it down over the route from Georgian Bay to Lake Ontario. That may be the end he has in view. The ship railway is a monument of folly where it is, and I suppose he would hope to use it to transfer ships from Georgian Bay to Lake Ontario. But, if it should come to that, it will cost the country vastly more than this company will. I do not see how the hon. member for West Toronto can face his constituents and justify the position he has taken. The hon. member for West York made some reference to the fact that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), and myself appear as directors. I can only say that the promoters of the other Bill were anxious to add these names to their Bill, and the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), in order to meet them so far as that is concerned, suggested that the names should be put in his Bill. I had no desire to go on the Bill, but I went so far as to meet the request of my hon. friend. I know that the promoter of the Bill only went on the Bill himself as a guarantee of good faith and at the earnest solicitation of some members from Toronto, as well as others who were here. So, there is no scheme in that. I have been in parliament a good many years, and I have never benefited to the extent of ten cents. It comes with very bad grace from the hon. member for West York to insinuate that there was some attempt on the part of some members of this House to line their pockets out of a scheme of this kind. I may say I have never bought ordnance lands at a quarter their value and sold them afterwards at ten times what they cost me. I never went to the Minister of Railways and Canals and coaxed him to sell me property that I might sell it afterwards at ten times what I paid for it. When the hon. gentleman catches me in any transaction of that kind he can charge me with doing what is improper, but he need not make such insinuations when he himself is the man who used his position here as a member of the House and supporter of the late government to advance his own interest. He had better not try to make any insinuations with regard to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), a gentleman who has a clean

record, a record which is a credit to him. The hon. member for Kent has promoted this Bill from the start as a matter of pure patriotism and with a desire to do what he could for the city of Toronto, and he is getting a poor reward from the hon. member for West Toronto and the hon. member for West York for the gallant manner in which he has fought to get this Bill through. I believe that if the Bill goes through, as it should, the enterprise will be a success, and it will be a great advantage to the city of Toronto. And I believe the time will come when my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) who insists on the passage of this clause will hide his face in shame, and will regret that he has played into the hands of men who are merely trying to prevent the success of this enterprise in order that their little scheme may come in, and the hon. member for West York and the hon. member for West Toronto may some day in the future take part in the scheme or get their friends in to control it in place of my hon. friend from Kent.

Mr. GEORGE GUILLET (West Northumberland). I desire to take this opportunity of saying that I am in favour of government ownership of railways as far as practicable and of the application of that principle by this amendment, and I have not heard any sound argument why it should not be adopted. I am not desirous of killing the Bill as has been charged from the other side of the House. I believe the whole discussion of this Bill proves that the promoters of this amendment desire that when parliament are granting such powers a reservation should be made in the charter that if at any time public interest should demand it the government may resume those charters. This is a national enterprise. This Bill provides for diminishing the distance between the points of shipment and ocean ports by 300 miles. That is no small matter especially when we consider that it will also avoid the most dangerous navigation of the water route. There is this important advantage in this route that not only will it save time but it will diminish risk of danger and loss of property. We know that the navigation on the south part of Lake Huron and the navigation on Lake Erie to the canal is the most dangerous part of the route that is to be traversed by shipments from Duluth, Chicago, Port Arthur and other points west to the St. Lawrence. This company will also be able to carry freight by vessels of an enormous capacity from these points in the west to Collingwood, and will thus be able to carry it much cheaper than smaller vessels and therefore much cheaper than it can be done via the canal. This being the case I think it desirable that the government should control that route in order to prevent discrimination in favour of an American route against our own ports. For instance the route via Ogdensburg to New York. A