

ship. Well would it have been for this country—it would have saved this country, I believe, two billion dollars and I could not tell how much more in rates—had the historic Liberal policy that was adopted by Alexander Mackenzie been followed. But Alexander Mackenzie's Government was defeated, Sir John Macdonald's Government came into office and they made the Canadian Pacific contract which Sir John Willison declared was the most insane contract ever entered into by a free people. I have not time to discuss that contract to-night.

I remember that the prophet from Brome, (Mr. McMaster) the other night invited us up to Mount Carmel and in a subsequent speech he also invited us up to Mount Delectable so that we on this side might have a view of the Promised Land. I was one of the simpletons who, twenty-five years ago, with the Liberal party of those days, went up Mount Delectable to have a view of the Promised Land believing that we were to have free trade and public ownership of railways. But I was led back to the wilderness; the Liberals went asleep for fifteen years and I got lost.

An hon. MEMBER: You are still lost.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I had to find my way out; I had to blaze my own trail. I now find myself in fairly good company, because I am happy to be able to agree with the declarations of the Acting Prime Minister this afternoon that there is more Liberalism in one tier of seats on this side of the House than there is on the other side altogether. It is disappointing to me, as it is to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), to hear member after member on the other side repudiating the idea of public ownership and going back on the policy made, I might say, almost sacred by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, the honoured leader of the Liberal party. What can we expect? Take our intelligent, able and cordial friend the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe). I divine from his statement to-night, to which I listened with mixed pleasure, that he is not in favour of public ownership because he says, public ownership is really opposed to Liberalism.

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. member allow me—?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Do not interrupt me at present. I do not want to put my hon. friend in a wrong position because I personally like him very much. But I say that the impression that he has made on my mind, and I am afraid on the minds of

[Mr. Richardson.]

other hon. members on this side, is that he is opposed to public ownership.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: I said I had an open mind on the question, but that no man has the right to chase away from Liberalism one who is opposed to the public ownership of railways.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am delighted to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, so I will leave his case and pass on to that of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), another old friend of mine. Now I challenged that hon. gentleman on several occasions in this House, when he was denouncing the policy that the Government was pursuing, to state what policy he would adopt; but, like the old Presbyterian minister, he looked the difficulty squarely in the face and passed on; he would not tell, and he will not tell yet. I wager that even if I sit down the hon. gentleman will not tell us where he stands on this question. However, I think I can fairly draw the inference that he is opposed to public ownership, because he said a few moments ago that it was a dangerous policy. Moreover hon. gentlemen know how he fulminated against the policy in the House this afternoon; and now he quotes approvingly from Lord Shaughnessy. No wonder when the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) chased the Ethiopian out of the wood-pile this afternoon there was a row. Because hon. gentlemen opposite must see—they call themselves Liberals, but they must see—they are adopting a reactionary policy that is not Liberalism at all. I say that a man—particularly a member of this House, an ex-minister, and one of the chief leaders from Quebec—who denounces the policy of the Government is in duty bound to state what policy he would follow. But this shifting and shirking of responsibility, what are reasonable Liberals to think of it? What is the country to think of that policy? I like very much better the position of my old friend—a friend of mine for more years than I would like to tell, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau).

Mr. BUREAU: Do not give me away, I am only twenty-five.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I like much better his position; he comes out with perfect frankness and says: I am opposed to public ownership.

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I told the hon. gentleman the other day, that if he would give me half an hour I would be able to