

vative at all. The Liberal party, if they were wise, would constitute themselves the Conservative party in Ontario.

I am convinced, honourable gentlemen, that the taking over of the Canadian Northern, as has been suggested, would be in conformity with the wishes of the entire population west of this city; it would be entirely in conformity with the views of the people of Ontario and the four western provinces; because those provinces are all more or less socialistic and radical in character. But in the province of Quebec another condition prevails. That is an old, staid, careful, conservative province. It is governed by a Liberal Government, but at the same time it is a conservative, judicial and careful government. No such radical ideas would be entertained for one moment in the province of Quebec as prevail in Ontario and the western provinces; and I suppose that farther east a condition prevails similar to that in the province of Quebec; people down in that direction have more common sense. But the farther west you go, the more prevalent you will find the idea of public ownership and other socialistic principles. My firm conviction is that the majority of the people of this country will be in accord with the action of the Government in taking over the Canadian Northern Railway system, and eventually nationalizing the Grand Trunk Pacific, and there is no doubt that the Government will have to go a step further and nationalize also the Canadian Pacific railway. There can be no other outcome, whether we like it or not. I am not one of those who like it, and I frankly say so; but the die is cast, honourable gentlemen, and it is now determined, without any doubt, that all the roads of this country shall be nationalized and operated by the Government. I admit that good results may accrue, if political considerations can be kept out.

If government ownership had been the condition from the first, do you suppose, honourable gentlemen, that we should have had the unnecessary duplication of roads which we now find all over this country? Do you suppose that there would be three lines from Belleville to Toronto? Do you suppose there would be the present number of roads between Ottawa and Montreal? That condition prevails all over Canada simply because of the private building of roads, each company aiming to get the

traffic in its district. The multiplication of railways over this country is a very great detriment indeed.

In England to-day, as I understand it, the railroads are practically under government control and there is a co-ordination among the various railways. I understand that in the United States also there is an arrangement of a similar character amongst the presidents of the different lines, and there is a good deal of co-operation.

I speak, honourable gentlemen, with very great difficulty. I have a trouble which makes it very difficult for me to speak, and I would not have spoken on this occasion at all but for the peculiar position which I occupy. I want to give reasons why I am acting as I do on this occasion.

The Dominion Government became part and parcel of this road in 1914, when they took over some \$40,000,000 of its stock. At that time I thought it was a mistake for the Government to do so. I do not know the reason why it was done, but having done so, it is really a partner to-day in the ownership of this road. I want to ask honourable gentlemen if it would be a fair proposition on the part of the Dominion Government, being a partner in the ownership of this road, to deprive the men who have borne the brunt of the construction and carrying on of this work without any consideration whatever? I have not heard that proposition denied; all who have spoken, both commoners and senators, say they think Mackenzie and Mann should receive some consideration, and the important question is how that should be decided. There are only two methods, decision by Parliament or decision by arbitration. I believe that arbitration is the fairer system. I know nothing of and have not the remotest idea as to the expectations of Mackenzie and Mann. They may get nothing at all, or they may get something; it will be for the arbitrators to decide. An arbitrator will be chosen on the part of the Government, one on the part of the custodians or owners of the stock, and the third will be named by those two, or by the Exchequer Court in case of their disagreement. The decision of the arbitrators must be unanimous; if not, the question must be referred to the Supreme Court. To my mind there can be nothing fairer; and, as no suggestion of an alternative proposition has been made, I feel absolutely constrained to support the measure which is proposed by the Government.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS.