

wrong. I do not think the leader of the Opposition in the other House has ever stated what my honourable friend says he did state.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: My honourable friend is absolutely incorrect, because if he reads the debate he will see that Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier has distinctly given his judgment against a receivership.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE: Go on with your speech.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I have stated that, in the building of railways, excepting the two instances which I have named, the people of this country furnish the means or the credit by which our railways are built, and the common stock of a railway which may not be valuable to-day may have a very large prospective value. The Canadian Pacific Railway company authorized the issuance of a large amount of common stock. The gentlemen who built that road were not men of wealth; they were not men who had private means to put into the construction of a railway, and they did not do so. Their whole financing was on that which was afforded them by the Dominion Government and what further financing they could do, based on the Government's assistance. The common stock when issued did not represent any capital put into the construction—none whatever. But some time after the road was in operation they issued that stock, I think, at about 25 cents. Am I right in that?

Hon. Mr. NICHOLLS: Twenty cents.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Twenty cents; and the large fortunes which were made out of that construction were made by that means. The president of the road at that time, and until he became engaged in the St. Paul-Manitoba road, was an ordinary merchant in Montreal, and not at all wealthy. He became a very rich man, so rich that he was able to buy an estate in England and has lived there ever since. All the other gentlemen engaged in that construction became wealthy, but, as I have stated, not out of the construction of the road, but out of the accrued value of the common stock after the road was built. In this instance it is suggested that Mackenzie and Mann might perhaps be accorded some of the common stock. That is suggested in the majority report on the inquiry into the railway situation. It has also been suggested in this House and in the other House. If Mackenzie and Mann were to

participate in the management and operation of the road, that, I think—although I do not know, but am speaking from my own standpoint—might occur to them as being reasonable. But they are to be dissociated entirely from the operation and management of the road. Therefore a more absurd proposition could not be made.

It is granted that the Canadian Northern is the most cheaply built of the three railroads in Canada. It is conceded that it is the best located road. It is conceded that in Manitoba and the other western provinces the Canadian Northern is provided with the most useful and the greatest number of feeders. These gentlemen have devoted the best of their lives to the construction of the work which is now to be taken over by Canada and to become part of Canada's possessions.

It is shown by the balance-sheet that there is an actual surplus to-day, apart from the question of the value of the stock, which I admit has not at present a market value. But the stock has a prospective value, and I am firmly of the belief that the future will determine that.

Two courses are open to-day: either that Parliament should adjudicate on the question and say that the owners of the company shall get a certain amount, if anything, or that the question shall be left to an independent arbitration. In my humble opinion, an arbitration by an independent party outside of Parliament is the best thing to have. A question that was very much discussed in another place was the character of the Government representative upon the arbitration board. My humble opinion is that there is the weakest part of the whole proposition, so far as the interests of Mackenzie and Mann are concerned, because that gentleman, while ranked as a Conservative, is not a Conservative and was not when he was leader of the Opposition in the Ontario legislature. He is a radical of the most extreme character, bordering on socialism, and if I were in the position of Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann, I would be decidedly afraid of the results so far as that gentleman is concerned. I think that if an injustice is done to Mackenzie and Mann, it is by that appointment. What are the conditions in Ontario to-day? Ontario has followed the lead given by that gentleman when he was leader of the Opposition in the Ontario House. The whole Government system of Ontario to-day is socialistic, highly radical. It is not Conser-