

Perhaps the honourable gentleman can tell us whether they did or not.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: Then I will take the word of the honourable gentleman, and I will relieve the company of all responsibility. I say that if the company did not demand value, and the present Government has offered either to give it to them, or to submit the question to arbitration, it has done a damnable outrage to the country of Canada.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Order.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: The word "damnable" is English. If the Government has done this, it is all the more to be condemned. What has the honourable gentleman to say to that? He is putting the Government in a worse light than I wanted to do. The very fact of the Government proposing a board of arbitration is sufficient proof that the company wanted full value for the stock. Now, what does the amendment moved by the leader of the Liberal people of this country in this House ask for? You have read it time and again. It says:

That the further consideration of the said Bill be deferred until the following information has been communicated to the Senate:

"The production of the report made to the Government by the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway System including the directors appointed to the board by the Government under section 16, chapter 20 of the statutes of 1914."

Through the Senate, the people of Canada are asking for the report submitted to the Government in regard to this transaction—that report made by the directors; and by a hostile vote in this Senate the people are going to be refused that information and be made to assume the debt under the provisions of the law. Is the Senate acting in its good, honest sense regarding the welfare of this country? In this amendment we are simply asking for the report submitted to the Government in this matter, and we are told that we cannot get it. Does the Government intend to have the ship scuttled in the dark? That is the question. Are they going to have the ship of state, the treasury, scuttled, robbed and pilfered, without giving us the information required? That is the question which honourable gentlemen on the other side of the House must decide for themselves. The position is more serious than some honourable gentlemen take it to be. I for one am always in favour of promoting public enterprise for public welfare, but I am one of those who is not prepared,

Hon. Mr. NICHOLLS.

and never will be prepared, to support public enterprise for private gain. I am prepared to vote not only \$60,000,000, but \$600,000,000 to the Canadian Northern railway if it is in the interests of the people, if there is no squandering of the national money; but I am certainly opposed to legislation of this kind which involves expenditure applicable only to private gain. The shareholders of this company who have the balance of the \$100,000,000 of stock in their names are not entitled to one cent from this country.

Now, is Parliament going to vote this money to them, whether it is 10, 20, 50 or 100 per cent of the stock. It is up to honourable gentlemen on the Government side to fix their consciences in this matter, and to say to themselves that it is all very well to stand by the party, but it is better to stand by the people. How many honourable gentlemen on the other side of the House will take that attitude? How many will say: "We have been sent here to vote for Conservative interests, Conservative policy and Conservative measures"? But how many men will undertake to stand before their country, and say: "It is true that I was nominated by my Prime Minister to serve the interests and the purposes of the Conservative party, but when it came to a showdown on a tremendous steal from the people of the country, I stood aloof and said, 'No.' " We shall see how many will do that. Let the country examine the vote when it takes place. This railway matter was very thoroughly gone into by the leader of the Government, who had control of the Bill, in submitting it to the House. He very devotedly lamented the fact that if this company was allowed to go into insolvency or into the hands of a receiver, it would have a bad effect on the interests of the creditors, the guarantors, and all the other people. His argument at first sight seemed to be plausible, but the more you weigh it and examine it, the more you see that there is very little foundation for it. For instance, he said that this road was not a unit, but was composed of some five, six or seven, companies; that there were six or seven branches, some running in Ontario, some in Quebec, some in Alberta and other provinces; and that if the company had to throw up the sponge it must go into the hands of at least six receivers. I am not going to dispute that, but I will point out that there are really no six companies. All the roads, subsidiary or otherwise, of the Canadian Northern system are held by the same peo-