

by reason of that order of the board, that order should be suspended for the time being so that we may have the use of that station. Having a model station there, we shall presently have more of them throughout the country. I am not proposing any extravagant expenditures in connection with stations; but I believe you will see a better station at Montreal soon, and the result will be the building of better stations throughout the country. As soon as the Government say to the people of Canada: Support your own railways, I am sure the people will go to the support of their railways, and that will not be to the detriment of the Canadian Pacific, because there is a future for both railways in Canada. I want to point out one thing to the Canadian Pacific railway, namely, that it will find in this new Government system a better co-worker and ally than in the old system. I hope before long that some kind of pooling arrangement or, perhaps, a distribution of some of the territories, giving the lead at one point to one road and at another point to another, will be arranged for. But the Canadian Pacific is not going to be damaged or injured in any way by our having a real national line owned by the people and extending all the way across the continent. I have every confidence that, now that the national system of railways has been established, it will prove a great success and the people will see the benefits of this policy.

My prediction is—and I want to be judged by my prediction, and I have not often been wrong in connection with the railways of this country—that within five years the United States Government will own the railways of that country. They will find that they will have to follow our example, and I believe the Americans will take their railways out of politics. I know that one of the planks in the platform of the Republican party is that they are against public ownership of railways, but I believe the great majority of the people of the United States are in favour of public ownership just as the majority of the people of Canada are. That being the case, I hope the consolidation will go on, and again I say to the Minister of Railways that it is perhaps not going on fast enough. We have a committee to consolidate the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern, and to my mind the consolidation is going on a little too slowly. I hope it will move quicker now, and that we shall see all these useless stations closed and unnecessary officials dismissed and a large portion of

the railroads for the first time devoted to service rather than to the making of profits for shareholders. That is the underlying principle that commends itself to me in favour of public ownership.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I want to make one or two observations on the subject of transportation in this country, because it has a very deep interest for me. The hon. member for Pontiac, who opened the discussion, expressed a preference for private ownership under public control. I cannot quite understand what the hon. gentleman was driving at, because we have had private ownership in this country under semi-public control, through the Railway Commission, and it has not proved a wonderful success. It passes my comprehension how any hon. member of this House who has made any serious study of the railway question in this country can take a position opposed to public ownership. Very frequently we hear it charged—I have heard it charged session after session in this House—that the Government voluntarily embarked on this public ownership policy, and that it was sure to prove a national disaster. Now I think it cannot be too frequently repeated that the Government did not voluntarily embark on a policy of public ownership. Private ownership came to a disastrous end in this country, and it probably could not have been otherwise, because, as you will find by the records, every railroad in this country—even including the great Canadian Pacific, which cost such an immense amount of money, was subsidized by the people of this country to an extent that Sir John Willison in an article in a newspaper described as “an outrage on a free people”—was practically paid for by the people. We need not go back to discuss the Canadian Pacific railway, but every dollar that road cost has been put up by the people of this country. After that road had been built, we undertook to embark on another great transcontinental railway, the Transcontinental, which was to have cost the people of this country some \$13,000,000. As a matter of fact, the road has cost us \$250,000,000. It is true it is a splendidly built road, extending 1,800 miles, but I do not think it has sufficient traffic to pay for its axle grease. The question is, should that road be abandoned? There are many people who think it should, because it is a charge on public ownership. The old Grand Trunk, which by its contract undertook to operate the road, positively refused to do so, and the road is now thrown on