

small. There is one place where my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) can find that it is writ infinitely smaller, that is in the Liberal platform of 1893. We see one party, with its thousands of supporters, pledging itself in all the fervor of its multitude, assenting to a great and broad principle that there shall be no writing of protection at all in all the documents, and yet, after having so pledged themselves, they can go out into the next eleven years of administration and write protection over every bit of their policy and of their administration.

Mr. BERGERON. And write it large, too.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two ways of doing it, you take your choice, but I think I would rather have the manly way of stating what you propose to do and doing it than of stating the opposite and then introducing and keeping protection in the fiscal legislation and administration of this country, to an extent, more burdensome than it has ever before fallen on the people of this country. My hon. friend told an amusing story as to which end of an egg you were to bite off before you made an omelet. My hon. friend did not bite off either end, he swallowed the whole egg, there were no bits about it, it was protection through and through, the whole of it was put down, aye, and not bolted in an honest, open fashion; he went behind the screen to do it, protesting all the time by all that was good and great, that he was an enemy of protection and a friend of free trade.

My hon. friend made a laboured argument with reference to government ownership of railways as well as telephone lines. He seemed to pay special attention to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), in fact he forgot that there was any other audience about him for a time and he directed his gaze and his argument entirely to my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) and a great compliment to my hon. friend from South York. What is there in the wind? Is there to be another vacancy in the cabinet? I saw a hint in some good Liberal paper whilst the selecting process was going on, before these two fortunate gentlemen could read their title clear to mansions in the skies, that it was supposed that Mr. Maclean would be a Cabinet Minister in the ministry of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and as I say, listening to the almost perfervid tones in which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) addressed himself to the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and observing the smiling way in which my hon. friend from South York took it, I almost came to the conclusion that there was a deep, dark conspiracy somewhere which it would take more than Judge Winchester to hunt out. What was the whole argument of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with reference to railways? On the platform in the

Mr. FOSTER.

city of Toronto in 1904, he declared, when he found that the Intercolonial Railway had been a failure in certain respects, that it was not due to my hon. friend here who was once Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) or to the then Minister of Railways or to any Minister of Railways; it was due to the vicious system which prevailed. Now, the whole argument drawn to a logical conclusion urges my hon. friend, drives him inevitably in what direction with his Intercolonial Railway? His whole argument has been against government ownership, that it operates against efficiency, that it does not instill the emulating, ambitious spirit in its officials and workers to make the road a success as compared with what private men, a corporation would do; he condemned it by every argument. Does he propose to hand this over to a private corporation as well? Logically he cannot escape from his argument, if his argument is sound.

He twitted my hon. friend with arguing in one way and concluding in another. Then he proceeded to do the same thing himself. He argued against government ownership. Is he prepared to give up the government ownership of the Intercolonial Railway? His argument is worth nothing unless his actions will carry out the strength of the argument. It was refreshing to hear my right hon. friend praise in such dulcet tones and with such luminous language the Canadian Pacific Railway. In times gone by I have listened to my right hon. friend when he was not so complimentary to that corporation and that railway. I have listened to him when he denounced in every mood and tense the Canadian Pacific Railway—this giant monopoly, as he then called it. To-day he is coming nearer to the measure of justice, and he has absolutely declared that the Canadian Pacific Railway is the great beneficent machine which has done more for the development of this Canada of ours than perhaps any one agency in the whole country. I agree with him in that. Nobody proposes to fight corporations in so far as corporations do their proper work, in so far as corporations treat the people that they serve in a just and reasonable way. But it is an equally fair statement that there are regions and areas and directions in which government ownership in all these things may be put into proper execution. He finds fault with my hon. friend because he does not come out and say that he is going to confiscate every corporation and undo a system which has been accumulating for ages. No sane man would do that. The circumstances of the case must be taken into account. But, Sir, if we were commencing again in this country, with the knowledge we have now, there would be far more things owned and operated by government than are owned and operated to-day. In the illimitable development which Canada faces as the years