

for that reason he got the charter through the committee. I believe that is what the hon. gentleman said, and I think the language is rather strong. But, I suppose the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), has been a pretty good manipulator of railroad charters in the past; and we know the old saying: 'Set a thief to catch a thief'—he is evidently after the scalp of the hon. member for Kent. It is interesting to know that the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), has seen new light. I, myself, have heard the hon. gentleman denounce government ownership of railroads. I remember that on one occasion, he took the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), to task on that very point and loftily told him that all young men who come into this House have a fad, and the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bostock's) fad was government ownership of railways. I think my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), is once more to be complimented. We can remember how on one occasion he dragged the hon. leader of the opposition into rising and opposing a proposition which he had publicly favoured before it came under the attention of the House. It is evident that he has converted his leader now to the idea of government ownership of railways. I am glad that hon. gentlemen on the other side have at last repented of their sins—and they have a great many to repent of. They controlled the legislation of this country for eighteen years, but I never heard their proposing the adoption of this principle before. Look at the immense quantity of public lands that they have given away to railroad corporations—about 64,000,000 acres—besides money grants. Now, after the steed is stolen, the leader of the opposition and his friends turn around and want to lock the stable door. That is practically what it means. I am bound to say that if the leader of the opposition and his friends had adopted that principle before, we should have been better off to-day. But it is rather late in the day for these hon. gentlemen to work up such a fad in connection with this tu'penny-ha'penny bit of a road from Georgian Bay to Toronto. I would remind the hon. leader of the opposition that, two years ago, we had before us a Bill relating to a main artery of communication from the great west, the Rainy River Bill. I never heard at that time of the hon. gentleman getting up and talking about the government ownership of railways, though the hon. member for East York and some of his friends did. If the hon. leader of the opposition had taken on that occasion, the stand that he does to-day, it might have been some advantage to the people of the west. But he rises now and proposes to apply this new principle to this little road on the plea that it is going to be a great advantage to the west. He, and his friends care very little about what the people of the west need. When the

ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), was discussing the railway problem, some time ago. I was surprised at one statement he made, which was:

I think that in considering this question, the inquiry should be limited to the transportation facilities from the head waters of Lake Superior.

That is, they were all quarrelling, like dogs over a bone, about what should be done with the wheat that had been raised by the farmers of the west, after it had reached the head of Lake Superior. Every man had his own particular fad, his own particular scheme for carrying it eastward from there. But the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals gave the whole thing away, because he made it apparent that they did not want to interfere with their friends, the railway corporations in the west, and so they would consider the question only from the time the wheat reached the head of Lake Superior. I have on previous occasions drawn the attention of the House to the fact that we were paying 14 cents a hundred, for hauling wheat from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, while from Buffalo to New York, which is about the same distance, it is carried for 4 cents a hundred. If the hon. gentlemen were sincere in the views they expressed with regard to this transportation problem, they would do something to get a reduction of the freights in the west. But as a panacea of all the ills that the west suffers from, they come forward with this fad—fake. I might call it—of having the principle of government ownership of railways applied to this little bit of link from Georgian Bay to Toronto. I must say that the opposition is like the Irishman's flea—when you put your finger on them, they are not there. I have heard them more than once denounce the principle of government ownership of railways, and point to the Intercolonial Railway as an object lesson. But the leader of the opposition, when he was in Winnipeg, said he was ready to adopt the principle as far as possible. But now he comes before us, like a lightning-change artist, ready to advocate the whole principle with regard to this little bit of a link of railway. I would like to know where we are to find him. For my part, although a great many people in the west are in favour of government ownership of railways, I am willing to say that I am not. I do not believe it is to the advantage of the country to have government ownership of railways. I believe that all the railroads should be controlled, the freight rates, passenger rates, tolls and everything else, should be controlled by the government, and we should have a railroad commission, to see that they are properly controlled. But to talk of having government ownership of railroads, why, it would simply mean that the poor people would have to pay more than they are paying to-day. The man with a pull, is the man who would get the advantage. The man who had