

clause 16 was to stand. He said that it was a most serious objection that was taken to it and that it would receive consideration. What did the Acting Prime Minister do? He left the House after he had made his long speech and he never gave a second's consideration to this clause of the Bill. He never gave the Committee or the House an opportunity of dealing with it any more, but he applied the closure, and the section to which he had promised serious consideration was never considered, and the closure was applied without considering it. Is he going to tell the people that it was necessary to apply the closure without carrying out what he had promised?

I submit that the revenue derived from the operation of public railways should be absolutely under the control of Parliament and that the motion moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens embodies the only method by which this Bill should be dealt with and which brings the operation of these railways and public ownership absolutely and properly under the control of this House.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to delay the House for a moment if it is waiting to divide, but I can assure you that I shall endeavour to confine what I have to say to the limits of such a speech as I have always thought should be made on the third reading of a measure. The hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) has struggled manfully with a situation, which he, himself, feels to be difficult. He had every appearance of a man who was struggling with difficulties that he reared himself, started off and he said that he believed in a man who was not carried away with every breath of doctrine. I quite believe in the honesty of my hon. friend; I quite believe that he wants to think that he is such a man and I quite agree that he is nearly always such a man, but he has given evidence of having fallen a little short upon this occasion.

In regard to Government ownership, I must say that I think the whole matter does not arise on the discussion at all. But I watched the proceedings very carefully on a certain Friday night and a certain Monday night; I saw my hon. friend rise and read what he stated was his attitude in regard to Government ownership in the previous session, and my recollection is that he led the House to believe that he read it to show that he had not changed and that he was in that position still. If

[Mr. McKenzie.]

that be his position it is a perfectly honourable one, although I did think that on the Monday evening he showed just a little sign of wavering. I may have been wrong in my impression; I should have been glad to have believed that he had stuck to his position of Friday night. I do think at the present moment that that was still his position on Friday night, but I know his attitude did not convey the same impression to the House on Friday night that it did on Monday night. I am not impressed, nor edified, when he stands up and wants us to think of him as a man who is not carried away by new breaths of doctrine.

In regard to what my hon. friend said about the closure, and whether there was obstruction or not, I should apologise for referring to this matter in view of the debate we had on Friday night and on Monday night. But I think I can give an illustration that even my hon. friend would have difficulty in getting over as to the existence of obstruction. My hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) rose, with a broad smile which indicated a good deal of internal amusement at the role he was playing, and I am perfectly sure that he said ten times in not fewer than as many minutes, that he was seeking information. Well, that is a perfectly harmless remark, and the most of us might have agreed with the need for information. But when he repeated that statement ten times within ten minutes I submit to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that that was coming pretty near obstruction. I do not want to press the point. We all know what obstruction is. Needless repetition has been the definition which has been given to obstruction in the Parliament of Great Britain. I do not think the hon. member for Pontiac would not say that he was needlessly repeating himself when he said again and again in my hearing that he rose for information, that he had not the information and that he wanted it.

Now, with regard to the matter before the House, Mr. Speaker, I should always wish to give the utmost attention to anything that was advanced here by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding). It may be conceded that this is a new departure or partakes of the nature of a new departure, but I cannot help thinking that that is more apparent than real. As to its being a new departure, Sir, I would just say this: That not only this country, but the world is in the midst of new departures, and we cannot help ourselves. We are in the midst of new