

Mr. FOURNIER: The leader of the Government must look in the direction of his associates; Toronto magnates, malefactors, and, if the expression is permissible, unscrupulous financiers. They are the men that have brought about the present condition of affairs, because they were the bondholders, and they knew that if the Government should take over this railway those bonds would be enormously increased in value and they would be saved from disaster. We now have on our hands what the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) pronounced not long ago in Montreal to be a "white elephant." As I do not profess to belong to the so-called aristocracy I will state, in the common, ordinary language of the day, that the public has been handed a lemon. Who wrecked these national enterprises? Take the Transcontinental railway. We were told on the floor of the House by no less a personage than the leader of the Government that the Transcontinental line was an awful thing. But I ask, who wrecked the Transcontinental line? The Acting Prime Minister, in his remarks on Friday night, spoke of this and other railway enterprises as "dirty Liberal babies." When the Transcontinental was in operation, when my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, came into office, what was done with this great railway which was to connect the West with our Atlantic seaports, which was to carry western grain for seven cents a bushel cheaper than any other railway, and which would prove a shorter route to our ocean ports by hundreds of miles than any existing line? Have we not to blame Toronto magnates and unscrupulous financiers? It has been said that all our grain is going by the New York route. If our anticipations in carrying our western grain to our own seaports have not been realized, if the Transcontinental has not proved a success, who is responsible for it? The Acting Minister of Finance charges that we Liberals are unpatriotic. In what category should we place those who have wrecked this railway system? Does my hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) think I am going to quietly listen to lectures from him in view of such a record? Not on your tintype. We are conversant with the facts and we know all about the management of the Intercolonial which is referred to frequently as a perpetual national scandal. The Acting Minister of Finance virtually says to us "Believe in all I say." The minister when he takes that position resembles a woman who was reprimanded one day by her husband. Whether she had done wrong

or not I cannot say, but her husband made an accusation against her and her reply was "No, I did not do it." "You did," he observed, "because I saw you," whereupon she retorted, "Do you believe the evidence of your own eyes more than you do my word? If so, what sort of a man are you?" In the same way the Acting Minister of Finance takes the position: If you do not believe me what sort of Liberals are you? The minister has presented a very strong indictment of Liberals because they have asked questions. We have been a little bit scrupulous and hesitant about passing all the clauses of this Bill in the absence of complete information. I say to the minister that his indictment of Liberals was not to my liking and I shall, regardless of whoever it may concern, offer a little indictment of my own, and I would ask those affected by it to paste it in their hat so they may see it quite frequently. The minister says I am not patriotic. Very well, here is my reply to that:

Patrician, aristocrat, Tory—whatever his age or name,
To the people's rights and liberties, a traitor ever the same.
The natural crowd is a mob to him, their prayer a vulgar rhyme;
The free man's speech is sedition, and the patriot's deed a crime;
Whatever the race, the law, the land,—whatever the time or throne,—
The Tory is always a traitor to every class but his own.

Mr. MANION: The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and for whom I entertain a very sincere friendship, made the statement that this country has been handed a lemon in taking over these railways. I do not know that I particularly care to quarrel with him as to the accuracy of the statement, but if this country has to relieve the existing financial thirst to a certain extent, it must be by making a certain amount of lemonade out of that lemon. That is the only observation I have to make with regard to the so-called lemon which we have taken over. I have listened for the last three or four days to the debate on this railway question, and so far as I have been able to interpret that debate, it has been more or less on the abstract principle of public ownership. I do not intend to impute any motives to the gentlemen sitting to your left, Mr. Chairman, because if they, and if we all, looked back over the history of public ownership in this country, we might find a good deal of reason for criticising public ownership in general. But the trouble in the past has been that we have mixed politics and