

to believe, then I think that railway ought to be in a position in which it can be taken over by the government upon reasonable and favourable terms, not upon such terms as we would have to pay to the owners of that property in franchise and prospective profits, profits which they might be able to convince a board of arbitrators they could earn out of the future operation of that railway, but giving them the actual value of the property at the time when the expropriation was made. That being my opinion, and the hon. gentleman having eliminated from his resolution what I conceived to be an objection to it, I feel it my duty to vote for the amendment as proposed by him. I think we protect everybody's interest when we assure to them the value of the property. Nobody can complain. I do not think financial men will go into it less readily, because there is a probability that the government may take over this railway on those terms. I believe that if we included the other clause it would have a very injurious effect upon the financing of this enterprise, and therefore, I am prepared to vote for the resolution. I think we give every protection the government and parliament can afford. If we desire hereafter to give aid to this undertaking, no matter in the hands of what company the construction of the road may pass, we can grant that bonus, annexing to it a condition that on the sale of the property that bonus shall be refunded. The government have every means of protecting themselves in that regard without doing any serious damage to the financial prospects of the company. I had hoped the hon. gentleman would accept the amendment as it had been proposed, because it strikes me it carries out the idea which was commonly entertained by the committee that a clause of this kind might in future be useful, and it would be well to incorporate it in the Bill.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I have listened to the statements made by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), and I do not think they require any reply, they were so utterly irrelevant and inaccurate, as is usually the case with the statements of that hon. gentleman. Now, with reference to the statement made by the member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), I am amazed to find a gentleman who in the Committee of Railways and Canals made the statement: We will give you the opportunity of buying out this road, we will have a clause put in our charter to carry that out; and to-day he utterly repudiates it and says: Why not give us this as in all other Bills, without any blot on its charter. As has been so well pointed out by the Minister of Railways and Canals, it is no blot on the charter; on the contrary, it gives strength to his charter, it gives stability to his charter; it shows the government

Mr. BLAIR.

are contemplating the acquisition of this road, and that therefore, men may with confidence invest their money in this enterprise. But from start to finish, what is it? It is only a bogus concern. Look at the original promoters. I do not speak of those gentlemen, members of parliament and others, but particularly of the members of parliament who have so brazenly affixed their names to this charter at a later period when they thought there was something in it. I think it is high time that the attention of the people and parliament should be called to the fact that members of parliament do not think it beneath their dignity or their sense of propriety, to get up in this House and advocate Bills in which they are personally interested; and voting those Bills through committee and advocating them. I see our friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), the member for Kent, and the member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood)—all these gentlemen adding their names to this charter. What for? Because they think there is something in it for somebody. I point out to the committee that the names of these gentlemen were before the committee as going to build this road. There is one of the promoters of this Bill who was named to this committee as an eminent capitalist, who was going to build the railroad almost out of his own pocket, and I was in a court not long ago and heard him say that he had borrowed \$300 to run his election, and he had not returned the money yet. And this is the man who is going to build a railroad costing millions.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Name.

Mr. WALLACE. I can tell him the name. W. J. Hill, M.P.P. for West York. I did not desire to name him, but the hon. gentleman insisted on it. I was in court when I heard him make that statement. Now, the hon. gentleman can take the responsibility of having his friend's name paraded before the country. Well Sir, this railway, I consider, should be under the control and guidance—

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did he not carry West York, without money and without price? He must be a good man.

Mr. WALLACE. No, it was by means of a series of scandals and disgraces that he carried West York.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You were seventeen days trying to prove it, and you could not prove a single case.

Mr. WALLACE. It was proved up to the hilt.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do not speak disrespectfully of the judges.