

in it and make the most of it—that is the way I view it.

I went on to say that I hoped the minister would come back to us the next year with a statement that would compare favourably with the position of the Canadian Pacific. I said that I knew of no reason why the minister could not get just as good men to run the road as the Canadian Pacific had. Now, I have not changed my position one wit from what it was a year ago. In discussing this Bill I had no occasion to say anything about private ownership. It was merely a question of how best to handle the property that we already had, and it was not fair for the Acting Prime Minister to switch off into a discussion of private ownership, because that was not involved in the question at all. When I was addressing myself to the people of the West, not only last year but some time before, I said that if the people of the West wanted the development of railways, wanted enterprise in building lines in different parts of the West, they would be disappointed in Government ownership. Why did I say that? I said it because the province from which I come and parts of the province of Quebec had had fifty years of Government ownership of the Intercolonial, and during that time not one inch of branch line had been built in the province of Nova Scotia. I had a right therefore to say to the people of the West that it was better for them to have the energy and enterprise of private ownership. I knew what the Canadian Pacific had done in the West, and I knew what Mackenzie and Mann would do if they had the money. I knew the country would develop more rapidly under private ownership of railways.

Mr. BURNHAM: What is the hon. gentleman's alternative to this Bill?

Mr. McKENZIE: That seems to be a sort of chronic attack of my hon. friend. He is a brainy business man, and I think I will leave it to him to find the alternative. I say that we are discussing this business, and we have a right to discuss it; we have a right to stick to the real business before us, and not switch off into a discussion of public versus private ownership. We already have the road, and all we have to do is to determine what principles shall be applied in the management of it. That is the real question before us, and I cannot understand how the minister could get away from it. Why, what do we see in the very preamble of the Bill, which is the

[Mr. McKenzie.]

context of the Act, explaining what the Act is about? The preamble says:

Whereas His Majesty on behalf of the Dominion of Canada has acquired control of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and of the various constituent and subsidiary companies comprising the Canadian Northern System.

The preamble says we have acquired the road. We are now simply dealing with the management of it. I have stated as clearly as I can my own position on government ownership. If the people of the West are to have government ownership, I trust that they will have a more cheerful experience than the people of the province of Nova Scotia have had, because our experience has not been good. I sincerely hope that theirs will be better, and that government ownership of railways will give them a better development than it has given to the Maritime Provinces. I was quoted by the Acting Prime Minister this afternoon as having said some years ago that that was one of the reasons why I did not think the good people of the West would be improving their position by substituting for the enterprise and energy of private ownership government ownership as we had experienced it in the East. Perhaps what was a failure with us will be a success in the West. I hope so; I hope that as years go by matters will improve in connection not only with government-owned railways, but everything else.

We were held up to contempt and obloquy the other night, and spoken of as traitors more or less to our own interests, because we were supposed to have said something in favour of the Canadian Pacific. Personally, I did not hear anybody say anything in favour of the Canadian Pacific. I did hear the Acting Prime Minister say to-day that the Canadian Pacific had served the country faithfully and well. Now, if the Canadian Pacific has served the country faithfully and well and given us a splendid service, should a public man in this House be found fault with for saying a good word on behalf of that institution, of which the Acting Prime Minister speaks so well? Obviously, no stigma can attach to any hon. member in this House who may have said something favourable to the Canadian Pacific.

The amendment before us cannot possibly have taken the Government by surprise. This Bill was founded upon a resolution, which was discussed very fully. When the resolution was before the House I told the minister that I could not agree to the principle of taking away from Parliament control of the revenue of Canada, and that