

he did not say. But my point is that the people that he refers to will be a great deal more tired before they are through with this railway question. It is the most important issue so far as the economic interests of the country are concerned. I scarcely think that it takes second place to the tariff—though possibly the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) will not agree with me on that. The railway question affects in a vital sense the interests of the people; it affects them to the extent of millions yearly. If you increase the rates, just see what it costs. The Canadian Pacific has built up an enormous surplus. Why was it able to do so? As Sir John Willison said, what the country did for the Canadian Pacific was the most insane bargain ever entered into by a free people. We gave them sufficient subsidies to build and equip the line two or three times over; no wonder they are in a specially good position to take care of themselves. The Canadian Pacific was endowed in oriental fashion and the Government is blamed if it deals with the publicly-owned system in a reasonably generous way. In my judgment, there is only one way in which this matter can be dealt with and that is by the method that the Government have adopted. As I sat here to-night, having advocated public ownership for thirty years, it was an inspiring incident to me to find that at last the chief members of the Government were strongly in favour of that principle. Public ownership is nothing new, as might be inferred from the words of the member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe). It is successful in the glorious country from which his ancestors come—France. I hesitate to quote Germany, but there the Government-owned railway system pays five per cent on the capital invested, and according to an article which I read in a magazine some time ago, four-fifths of the people travel at half-a-cent a mile because they have first, second, third and fourth classes. The Australasian colonies own all their railways. Switzerland, the most progressive republic in Europe, owns its railroads; Hungary owns its railroads, why should not Canada own its own railroads? Public ownership is the only system that can be followed; it has been forced upon the people. Such regulations must be enforced and the capitalization must be so limited that failure will be impossible. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company know that an efficient system can be created by the co-ordination of services, and that the people will be very friendly to their own

[Mr. Richardson.]

system. I admire as much as does the Acting Prime Minister the way that the Canadian Pacific is managed and operated, and the ability of its staff. We must make of the Canadian National railways a system which will appeal to the people just as strongly as does the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the minister willing to act upon the agreement which we have had all along to adjourn at eleven o'clock?

Mr. J. D. REID: I am not at all anxious that we sit late, but I do not think it is unreasonable to ask that we pass this one clause which we have been discussing all day, and take the Bill up again on Monday.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister must not forget that the Acting Prime Minister took up an hour and a quarter of the time of the Committee, the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) a few minutes and the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) some little time also. The question of public ownership has been discussed and during that time we have been unable to deal with this particular clause. We did not, therefore, take up all the time of the Committee.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am not finding fault with any one. We cannot get away from extending these charters; work has been done on them, and so on. I am not asking that we pass the schedule this evening, but why not pass this clause?

Mr. McKENZIE: I suggest that this section be left out of the Bill; that we go on with the Bill and incorporate the company, and that after the company is incorporated, which I hope will be within a short time, my hon. friend can come back to the House with a separate Bill asking for the revival of these charters. That Bill can then go to the Railway Committee; the officers of the company can be there and explain which of these forty-four charters they want extended or renewed. They may want them all; they may not want any of them. I think that is a fair proposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be about as effective obstruction as the ingenuity of the human mind could devise. We have discussed all day the renewal of charters that were the possession of companies that are now the property of the Dominion. We have asked now to pass the rest of the Bill, then come to Parliament with the proposal to renew these charters, then go over the resolution, with four or five discussions on that; then have the discussion in committee again; then the third reading—the whole thing duplicated. In a word, we are asked