

departures, and any man who thinks that we have not to try and be prepared to deal with new departures in the present condition of this country and of the world, is in danger of rapidly finding himself a back number in any guidance he gives to the affairs of the nation.

I think that my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister gave a most lucid, most cogent, and most forcible argument to the House, and I am bound to say, in all honesty, that it carried to me complete conviction. There were the two methods of dealing with this question after we decide upon public ownership; and even my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is constrained to admit that such is the condition in which these roads are, we are bound to decide upon it. Then I take it, either we were to administer the Canadian National Railroad as the Intercolonial has been administered, or we were to adopt the corporation method. Now, with regard to the Intercolonial railway, I must ask hon. gentlemen opposite (who are better acquainted with it than I am, who have lived in that part of the country and watched its operations) is it not a fact that under all Governments that road has reeked and smelt with political patronage? Is not that the case? If it be the case can this Government and Parliament lightly think of adopting a method for the Canadian National railroad which has led to the wholesale use of patronage in the limited experiment that we have been making on the Intercolonial in regard to this great question of Government ownership? The Acting Prime Minister says the Government has deliberately chosen the other method. For what purpose? To get rid, if possible, of political patronage; and if the Government does not get directors who will co-operate with it in this matter, it will be brought to very strict account by the people of this country. I believe that here is the crux of the whole thing. Let the Government say to its directors: We want this railroad run upon business lines, and we want the best men put in for doing any specific work in connection with it, and we do not want politics to interfere. If the Government does less than that it will very rapidly be brought to task by the people of this country. If the Government does that, I have stated my previous faith in Canada's ability to sustain this railroad, and to build it up to a degree of wealth and efficiency equal to that of the Canadian Pacific, and the two railroads will be part of the wonder which the Canada of the future is going to be in the world. The whole thing depends

upon getting the right men to carry the undertaking out—getting men in whose trustworthiness and ability you can have confidence, and Canada being behind the road it is bound to be a success. If we do not produce, and cannot produce, such men in Canada import them. Get honest, trustworthy and able men. Tell them they have got to run this, as a railway proposition, to success, and that they are not to consider political questions at all. Then I have such confidence in my country that I have faith in the future of this road.

As to the control of Parliament, I have said that this is a new departure. I think that in the case of Britain's handling of the Indian Accounts there may be a precedent for this line of action. But we do not forfeit, that I can see, any of our rights as a Parliament to look into the way the roads are being run. Something has to be done on trust in connection with such a large concern. Do the Canadian Pacific shareholders do nothing on trust in regard to their railroad, one of the biggest concerns in the world? Have the shareholders to do nothing on trust in connection with that road? Surely we can find men in Canada—or our politics and our public life are corrupt beyond description—surely we can find men to do for the nation what the directors of the Canadian Pacific are doing for the shareholders of that railway. I hope we can. I hope so from the bottom of my heart, for the sake of the future of the enterprise, for the sake of the future of the public life of Canada, for the sake of the prosperity, progress, and real welfare of this great Dominion. But I would appeal to my hon. friends opposite to take this attitude and force home from time to time—and I will help them in doing it if it is necessary—the points that I have made in my brief utterances. Force home these points, and criticize and observe all you can, but let us give Canada and her railroad a fair trial.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): I was somewhat pleased with the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Michael Clark) when he said that he had heard me repeat some ten times in as many minutes the remark that I was unable to get any information from the Government regarding the various clauses of this somewhat complicated Bill. I am glad to know, Mr. Speaker, that after having repeated ten or twelve times a plain, simple statement, it may have penetrated