

sess in Canada a means of transportation such as is possessed by no other part of the continent: not even the great Mississippi river can compare with the St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers in the matter of transportation for the purpose of developing the richest wheat producing and agricultural country in the world. I am asked, why we did not develop our transportation system when the Conservatives were in power. Well, we had not a Finance Minister who was generous enough to place at our disposal \$125,000,000 for transportation purposes, and if I had, I would have to-day in Canada a system of transportation without a rival on this continent, and which would have placed us in a position that we need not care for any other country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have dealt at sufficient length with this question. In all seriousness, let us try the scheme proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition; let us give it a chance. I believe that the country is with us, and that when we appeal to the people we shall receive a mandate to carry out his proposition. I believe that state ownership of railways is bound to be tried in this country. The people of Canada will not submit to the tyranny of corporations, especially railway corporations. We have given them special advantages; we have placed them in a position to earn large sums of money; and what we require from them is a return of fair rates and transportation facilities for the people of the country.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). Mr. Speaker, I have no intention this evening of making a speech. I have not prepared any speech. I have already stated in this House my views, and I believe also the views of the constituency which I represent, in regard to this trans-continental railway. But, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister, in the course of his speech to-night, made such an extended reference to the city which I have the honour to represent that I could not allow this discussion to pass by without saying a word or two, not only to correct the hon. gentleman to a certain extent, but in order that the ideas of the Board of Trade of the city of St. John, which he so largely quoted, should not be misrepresented in this House and all over the country. The hon. Minister of Finance quoted some of the resolutions which had been passed by the St. John Board of Trade; and if I heard him distinctly, I think he said those resolutions were passed in the month of May. Now, reference has been made to the evolution which takes place in public opinion, and reference was made in that connection to the idea of government ownership. I think the Minister of Finance spoke about platforms being used only to get in on, and the hon. gentleman related a little story in that connection. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his

Mr. HAGGART.

seat gave a very effective reply to that, when he made some reference to a platform known as the Liberal platform, which was adopted in the city of Ottawa some years ago. If I mistake not, one of the planks of that platform was that the Liberal party should advocate free trade as it was in England. So when the hon. Finance Minister shows that the government and the party which he represents are able to change their opinions very frequently, or as often they think necessary, surely gentlemen on this side of the House and the people of the country have a right to change their views also. As the country advances and education spreads among the people, views must necessarily change. The hon. Finance Minister referred to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who had voted against government ownership. Suppose hon. gentlemen on this side of the House or hon. gentlemen on the other side have at some time or other voted against government ownership, that is no reason why at this time or at some future time they should not be in favour of it. Government ownership might be all very well at one period of a nation's existence and a very poor thing at another period. These things must be determined by the facts as they are at the time. The hon. Minister of Finance quoted one or two resolutions passed by the St. John Board of Trade, but he did not quote them all, and I intend to fill up that little hiatus which he has left in the history of the proceedings in St. John. When I first had the opportunity of addressing this hon. House I referred to those resolutions, so that the fact that the hon. Minister of Finance has not referred to them is a little more noticeable than it would otherwise have been, because he certainly must have known of them. The resolutions which he read were passed in the month of May; the resolutions which I will read were passed in the month of August. The people of St. John were beginning to study this trans-continental railway scheme, and while they looked at it in the first place simply from an Intercolonial point of view, they began to think about other things in connection with it. They began to have it driven home to them that as there was nothing in this agreement to compel the routing of freight to maritime province ports, it was necessary to pass some resolutions other than those which the Minister of Finance has referred to; and the first one brought before the board of trade at the time I speak of reads as follows:

Whereas it is of vital importance to the development of the over-sea traffic of the Dominion that its exports should be shipped via Canadian ports, and

Whereas, under the terms of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway contract now under consideration by the Dominion parliament routed freight may be shipped via foreign ports, and

Whereas, there is reason to fear that a very large portion of the freight from the west by