estly? If we do, we have come to a pretty pass in this country. Therefore, I claim that this parliament should not hesitate to glance in the direction of government ownership of railways. That, I believe, will be the great issue in this Dominion within the next decade, and I regret exceedingly, as a Liberal, that any hon. members on this side should apparently appear as antagonistic to that view.

I entirely dissent from the view taken by the hon. member for Saskatchewan when he twitted the hon. leader of the opposition for supporting a measure of this kind. am delighted to see any great party take up a reform of this kind. When we had a similar question up last session in connection with the Rainy River road-a road which is bonused to an enormous extent by the people of this country—I moved a clause similar to the one under discussion, namely, that parliament could at any time take possession of the road. Yet, notwithstanding the fact that such large subsidies were given that road, that motion of mine was voted down, not only by members on this side, but by members on the other side as well. I feel very deeply on this question and will give my warmest approval to the amendment before the House.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). My hon, friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) is no doubt very sincere, but it is very clear to any one, who has any experience in the building of railways, that the hon. gentleman never was a railway builder, that he never built a mile of railway in his life and knows nothing about it. He has been hoodwinked into supporting the amendment introduced by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) for the purpose of killing the Bill. In the committee, when it was found that the other Bill, which these hon, gentlemen are promoting, could not go side by side with this one, they made every possible objection, and the hon. leader of the opposition drew on his enormous fund of tactics to obstruct in every way the passage of this measure. Any one who has any knowledge of the floating of bonds or the negotiations of loans upon railways will understand that a franchise which would be clouded by such an amendment as the one proposed could not float a bond. I would like to know whether the Canadian Pacific Railway would be willing to accept the intrinsic value of its entire line from the Atlantic to the Pacific. That road has cost the Canadian Pacific Railway an enormous amount in addition to the actual cost of construction, in the working up of its business and the establishing of connections, and it is only after years of effort that it has succeeded in reaching the creditable position it now occupies. Would the paying of the actual intrinsic value of that road recoup that company fairly and honestly for the expenditure it nor

has undergone? It certainly would not. There is nothing to prevent parliament taking over the Canadian Pacific Railway at any time, and if you pass this Bill, without the clause proposed, the government can take this particular road over when it chooses. There is another point and that is this. By this amendment you will fetter the government in taking over this line. I contend that the passing of this particular amendment would commit parliament, if it should decide to act on it, to take over all that this company possesses.

The hon, leader of the opposition objects

to Americans having anything to do with the Bill, and thinks that the scheme should be in the hands of citizens of the Dominion. He was not of that opinion when the company for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was incorporated. He was a member of the cabinet at the time, why did he not seek to keep out all Americans? He was quite ready to allow Americans and other foreigners to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway. But, it suits his purpose for the moment to use the con-nection of these foreigners with the scheme as a bugbear. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) had said something with regard to the great waterways. We all hope to see our great waterways a success. But, if any person will look at a map of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, he will see that but a very small portion of that country is now under cultivation. Even with so little under cultivation, from twenty-five to thirty million bushels of wheat has been exported. This tested carrying has the capacity canals. This being the case when our little development has taken place, so what should we look for when half or two-thirds of the wheat belt is un-der cultivation? It will test the carrying capacity of every canal and every railroad, including the one under consideration, to carry that wheat to the seaboard. I do not see why this clause should be forced on this committee. It has never been incorporated in the charter of any other line. As I said, the government have the power to take over this road the same as any other public property. I do not think that a specific clause of this kind should be inserted, because it will undoubtedly The object of the cripple the company. hon. member for West Toronto and the hon. member for West York is to kill the Bill. They may accomplish that, if they can get this clause passed. They think that with this clause inserted the company will be so crippled that it will not be able to float the scheme for the construction of the road. The Minister of Railways and Canals has expressed, no doubt, what are his own opinions. But, I feel sure that he does not express those opinions as a member of the government, do the members of the