

Minister of Railways wants to get a friend, or a relative of a friend, or some active supporter, put upon the road. He says: "You have got a thousand employees, and one more cannot make much difference." He puts the screws upon him, and succeeds in crowding some one upon the railway.

But there is a worse thing than that with reference to a Government railway, and nobody has experienced it more than I have myself. When you have built a road, and when you have over-manned the road, as you are almost compelled to do by the pressure that is put upon you, unless you are more than a man, there is a worse thing still, and that is that every man that has got a ton of freight to carry over the road, brings all the political influence he can upon the Government and the department, to carry that for nothing. Therefore, the Government is not in a position to preserve the interests of the public, nor to manage a railway in the same manner that a private company can manage it. I am glad to say that I need not pursue the question, because my hon. friend who has just sat down, has relieved our minds, and my mind especially, from the fear that the Government would jeopardize the best interests of Canada by an attempt to construct this as a Government railway.

Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who visited Australia a few years ago, and had an opportunity of witnessing State ownership and operation in action, said in his speech in the Senate in 1903, on the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme (Senate Debates, 1903, p. 1384):

This I will say, speaking for myself, I am opposed to Governments running railways, and if we are to take the Intercolonial Railway as a sample to guide us in the future, all I can say, God protect us from the financial results that must follow if the Government are to own and run many other roads in the future. * * I watched the operation of the railways in Australia when I was there. They are Government railways. They produce no argument to my mind that Governments can own and operate railways as well as it can be done by individuals. I believe to-day that if the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, had possession of the Intercolonial Railway, they would run it with as much advantage, if not more advantage, to the people living in the Maritime Provinces, and at less expense than it is run to-day, and they would run it without losing any money. That may be a heterodox view to some of my friends from the Maritime Provinces, but I have come to that conclusion from having watched the management and the operations of that road under both Governments, and having watched the operation of the Government-owned roads in the Australian colonies. I know there is an objection to handing it over to any private corporation for fear that it would result to the disadvantage of the people living in the Maritime Provinces. I do not believe that it would, and personally, I should like to see the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway take possession of that road, of only for a few years, to test the truth of the statement that I have made, and if it was found to work to the disadvantage of the provinces, they could easily terminate the contract and take it back into their own possession.

THE ONTARIO CONSERVATIVE LEADER.

At the time of Sir Alexander Galt's resolution, Dr. Sproule, then, as he still is, a Conservative member of the House of Commons, expressed his mind as follows:

In every instance where I have been able to take the sense of the people, I have invariably found that it was their desire to have the railway built by a company and not by the Government. The history of the construction of all public works shows that they cost more when constructed by the Government than when constructed by private companies. We have had some little experience of running railroads in Canada, and we may ask, if it cost us in one year \$716,083 to run the Intercolonial Railway, a road 800 miles long, passing through three settled provinces where there is a large trade, what