

it that way, we might as well throw up our hands and say that the whole thing is a hopeless mess. But I believe that it can be done; and because we want to run the whole thing as a business proposition I want to see the Intercolonial railway put in with the rest of it. The Minister of Railways has pointed out the impossibility of operating the Canadian National Railways down to Montreal and stopping there, not going on to Halifax and St. John. It is not in the interest of the Maritime Provinces that that should be done. The Government railways can be operated much more economically and in a much more businesslike manner if taken as a whole than they could if part of the system is run by the Canadian National Railway Company and part by the Minister of Railways.

I said in beginning that I did not intend to say very much, but I would not feel like giving a silent vote on a matter of such great importance to the Maritime Provinces. I believe that by incorporating practically the whole system of railways in the Maritime Provinces into this railway system, we are doing the Maritime Provinces the greatest possible benefit. If the operation of the national railways goes on as it has gone on during the last year and as I believe it will go in the future, it will not be many years before the people who now oppose this proposal will stand up to bless it and to say that the elimination of politics from the administration of the Government railways and the operation of those railways as a business proposition means the accomplishing of a great work for the people of Canada as a whole.

My hon. friend referred to freight rates. There may be some dislocation of freight rates; there may be cases in which we shall have to pay a little higher freight rates in the future than we have paid in the past. But there will also be cases where we shall get an efficient service, which we have been unable to get in the past. The member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) knows the trouble he had in his own county in an effort to get service under political management. He does not believe that there is any possibility of a repetition of these things in the future if the Government railways in the Maritime Provinces are run as a business proposition.

Mr. COPP: But I have no faith in the assumption that they will be run as a business proposition.

Mr. CARVELL: That is where we disagree. Until it is proved to me that they will not be run as a business proposition, I purpose considering that they will be.

My hon. friend knows that if this railway system is run as a business proposition it will do much more for the Maritime Provinces in the future than it has done in the past. For these reasons, I intend to vote against this amendment. I am satisfied that if the amendment is voted down the House or the country will never regret the incorporation of the Intercolonial railway in the great Canadian National Railway system.

Mr. PEDLOW: Would the minister inform the House why it is necessary to finance the Railway Department on a basis different from that on which the department that he controls is financed?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that question is in order; it has been decided by the vote which has just been taken.

Amendment (Mr. Copp) negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): I realize that the House is anxious to give a final vote on this Bill, and I shall trespass upon its time no further than to make a few brief remarks. First, I wish to correct a statement made by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), who represented me this afternoon as being a strong opponent of public ownership of railways. My hon. friend certainly misconstrued my words if he found in them an expression of opposition to the principle of the nationalization of railways. I merely said that nobody had the right to excommunicate from Liberalism those who were opposed to that principle. My speech was made to protest against the lectures on Liberalism which certain hon. gentlemen on the other side are prone to inflict upon us. I said then, and I repeat now, that public ownership, the nationalization of industries, is not a principle of Liberalism; it is state socialism. That does not mean that I am opposed to it. I am not afraid of words. My view is that it is a huge experiment—and I have not the same confidence in its ultimate success as some of my friends in the House seem to have. But we have no choice in the matter. We are the owners of a great system of railways, and we must try to make it the best system possible. We must, as many hon. members have said, give public ownership a fair chance.