

that only a few people were able to mail a letter because of the cost; the others could not afford it.

What happened? We socialized that service. That was all we did; we socialized it. The people own it and control it. The cost was brought down so that all people have access to it at very low cost. That is an instance of the socialization of a former private enterprise that we would never allow to go back to those hands again.

Another instance is highways. It is only a little over 100 years ago since most of the highways and bridges were toll highways and bridges. If you had not the money, you could not go very far from home. You had to have threepence or sixpence to pay for going over a stretch of road through some squire's domain or maybe across a bridge. But what happened? The thing was so silly—the people were not getting the best use of the roads because they were privately owned—that the government stepped in and socialized them.

The roads of Canada have always been socialized. We have therefore not had that problem. We have become so accustomed to the socialization of roads that we would never hand the roads and bridges back to private enterprise again; we are happy with the socialized state of the roads and bridges.

There are several other things that I could mention, but I see that my time is coming to a close. One is education. I well remember my grandmother telling me that in the village in which she lived education was all private. There were no public schools. You had to have your threepence or your sixpence a week or you could not get an education. All the schools were privately owned. There are still some that are privately owned, namely the profitable ones. The non-profitable ones went out of business very quickly, because the government of England at the time socialized education and made it available to all the people. We all appreciate it, now that it is socialized, and we would not go back to private enterprise or turn all the schools back to private enterprise. We know it functions to the benefit of all the people, so we keep to socialism. In the same way we have libraries that were private libraries.

We even had private armies in England. Various barons had their private armies and sometimes they grouped together to make a bigger army. Nevertheless they were still private armies paid by the baron or the lord of the manor, whatever the case might be. Eventually the stupidity of the situation struck the people and they socialized the army. Now it belongs to and protects the people as a whole. Those are some of the things that fall into the natural category of

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

socialism. I think the gas pipe line is in exactly the same category and should be socialized and financed by the federal, provincial and municipal governments in order to give the best service to the people of Canada as a whole.

Mr. Carrick: Mr. Chairman, I had the honour of speaking in this debate on second reading. At that time I confined myself entirely to a discussion of the merits of this project. Tonight I should like to speak on the issue of closure, because this debate has been converted into one on the question of closure and the propriety of the government applying closure.

Before I came to this house I thought members generally confined themselves to the issue. In my opinion the issue in this case is the wisdom of building the trans-Canada gas pipe line. One is not here very long before he finds out that issues are created for different purposes entirely, not having to do with the real problem before parliament but designed to attract votes. That is exactly what has happened. In this case there has been a probably unparalleled attempt centred on the question of closure. The opposition parties, the official Conservative opposition and the C.C.F., have described the closure issue as dictatorial conduct, totalitarianism, the gag and other extravagant epithets of that kind.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Carrick: My hon. friend says, "hear, hear".

Mr. Knowles: Where did we find those adjectives? Where did we get them? From Mackenzie King.

Mr. Carrick: I should like to have an opportunity to put my views before the committee. My friend has taken the time of this committee on a number of occasions in order to speak, and I do not ever remember interrupting him. I would expect him to extend the same courtesy to other members of this house.

I should like to put before you, Mr. Chairman, because I think it has not been made clear, what is the government's position with regard to closure. The real facts came out on Wednesday, when the Prime Minister made an offer to the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the C.C.F. party. He proposed to them that the house should sit on Wednesday night, something which it does not ordinarily do, and that the house should sit on Saturday if they wanted to have additional time to debate this issue. That offer was flatly refused, and in the course of the discussion the leader of the C.C.F. party, the