

for Welland. I have defeated every Tory that has appeared on the scene since then, and I intend to continue to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman will know better than I do. He may correct the statements in the Guide.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Talk railroad.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All right.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the hon. gentleman had better read Judge Galt's report in the case in Winnipeg.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I stated that the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) was reverting now, and taking the negative side of every scheme on which he took the positive side before.

I have no doubt that so long as the question of the Canadian Northern continues to be before Parliament he will pass over all the various schemes until he has completed the record of taking both sides of every one. The compass will be gone round again and again; he will support arbitration one day and expropriation the next. Then he will return and argue against arbitration, and the next day he will argue against expropriation. If arbitration is a wrong method to-day and expropriation is a right method before the Exchequer Court, why was expropriation a wrong method in 1914 and arbitration a right method? Why was it that Sir Walter Cassels was not eulogized as the proper man in 1914? Why did the hon. gentleman advocate arbitration? Why can we not take him at his word? Why can we not take his advice and depend upon its standing, having the assurance that when we adopt it he will not immediately repudiate it? In 1914 he did not argue in favour of expropriation. He did not say that this was a subject that could, under the Expropriation Act, properly or fittingly go before the Court of Exchequer.

Mr. GERMAN: I told my hon. friend in 1914 that it was the duty of the Government to take over the whole \$100,000,000 of stock. If that had been done you would not be having this trouble now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will read what my hon. friend's leader said on that occasion, and I will read the resolution which my hon. friend himself voted for. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said:

I said a moment ago that my intention was simply to summarize the views and the policy which we have laid before the people on this

question, and I summarize them in a few words. We must carry on this enterprise; we cannot allow it to go by default; we cannot allow anybody or anything to come in which would imply anything detrimental to our credit in England; this enterprise has to be carried out; but, instead of carrying it out in the way proposed, we propose that we should carry it out by other means—that we should take absolute control of the enterprise; and for that purpose, I beg to move, seconded by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley):

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved that under existing circumstances no assistance should be given to the Canadian Northern Railway Company unless at the same time it is provided that the Government have power, within a reasonable time to acquire the ownership of the entire stock of the company at a price to be fixed by arbitration, but not to exceed thirty million dollars.

The reason why the hon. gentleman now objects to arbitration is that it suggests a value—though no specific value is even suggested.

Mr. GERMAN: Does the hon. gentleman pretend that there is no difference between the conditions then and the conditions now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: But there is no difference between Mr. Justice Cassels then and Mr. Justice Cassels now. There is no difference between the principle of arbitration then and the principle of arbitration now.

Mr. GERMAN: No one suggested what board of arbitration the matter should be referred to. The resolution simply said that the price should be fixed by arbitration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then, that is not arbitration; it is expropriation?

Mr. GERMAN: Not at all. It is not expropriation; you would be referring the matter to the judge of the Exchequer Court as arbitrator.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman want this matter referred to the judge of the Exchequer Court as arbitrator?

Mr. GERMAN: I am not saying that at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think my hon. friend had better look over some of the old schemes rather than try to think of new ones. It was suggested in 1914 that we should take, not the rails, not the right of way, not the physical property of the company, but the stock; and that we should fix a maximum price of \$30,000,000. Would that not suggest that there may have been a value of at least \$30,000,000 in the stock? The resolution now before the committee does not suggest a dollar of value. If the arbitration board find that there is no value in the stock, we have no value to pay for the