

to \$170,000,000 while the other party incurs obligations of less than \$15,000,000 and obtains control, and possession of all direct profits and advantages. Let not my right hon. friend forget, and this at least I think ought to convince him, that for the enormous obligations which this country is undertaking it has absolutely no security whatever except the commercial success of the enterprise. I challenge any successful contradiction of that statement. If this enterprise is financially and commercially successful this Government has ample security, but if this enterprise is to be successful why should not the country which provides the cash own and control the enterprise? If this enterprise results in failure, then the Government has no security, and the Government will have to stand the brunt of that loss and failure.

Therefore, from every sensible business standpoint, there seems to be no reason whatever, why the Government—going to the extent of incurring nine-tenths of the obligations and of the expenditure necessary to construct this railway—should shrink from the other one-tenth in order to hand the railway over to a private corporation. It is called a national railway; it is not a national railway! It is a corporate railway, and not only is it a corporate railway, but it is a corporate railway controlled by a corporation which has direct and enormous interests in terminals in the United States; interests adverse to our national ports—adverse to an all-Canadian route. The fact is that the Government practically finances the enterprise, and then gives away the country's rights.

THE LIBERAL PARTY'S RAILWAY POLICY OF 1898

Shall we reverse the policy of extension of state ownership adopted five years ago? If it were not a policy of state ownership which dictated the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Levis to Montreal, I would like to know what it was? Was it not then foreshadowed by the Minister of Railways of the day, that the extension to Montreal was only a prelude to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the great lakes at least, and did not the Minister of Railways, speaking for the Government, say that it was necessary that the Intercolonial Railway should receive a fair, even a large share of the great and growing trade of the west? Did not the Minister of Railways of that day, relying on certain arrangements made with the Grand Trunk Company, hope to secure a large share of that traffic at Montreal, and have not these expectations been very cruelly disappointed?

Why does the Government of Canada see fit to reverse the policy of state ownership which it then adopted? Are we less capable now than we were five years ago of managing railways? Mr. Speaker, I think not. What the Government now proposes to do is practically