

politics will not be taken out of the Bill. What we have been fighting for is to vest in Parliament a little more power and to take from the Governor in Council some of the powers which are proposed to be granted by this Bill. I do not think we can be reproached on that account. Some hon. members on your right, Mr. Chairman, may think it is proper that the Governor in Council should run the country, and that Parliament should be convened simply to ratify Orders in Council. We on this side of the House do not think so; we think this country should be run by Parliament and that the administrative part delegated by Parliament to the Government should be taken care of by the Government. Surely we can differ on those questions without its being said that one side possesses all the ignorance and the know-nothings and that the other side is all-powerful and all-knowing, able to do everything. I do not believe that; I think God has been kind enough and good enough to endow every man in this world with a little something called brains, and that all the brains are not on the other side of the House. Thanks be to God, there are some brains on this side of the House, and outside of this House also.

On the second reading, I stated that I was against public ownership, my reason being, concisely, experience both with the Inter-colonial and in the United States. Last year we were taking our cues from the United States—we had to change our standard of cement; we had to change our standard of weights and measures, because the United States were changing theirs. If those cues were good enough last year, prudence ought to teach us to follow the example of the United States when they have had the experience they have had with public ownership.

I hope to-night, whatever our opinions may be as regards public or private ownership, we shall continue to devote our time to the consideration of the clauses of the Bill. Again I repeat, every time I have risen from my seat has been not for the purpose of opposing the Bill because I am against public ownership, but for the purpose of endeavouring, if possible, to improve the Bill and to protect the interest of the people, and so much so, that one of my amendments has been adopted by the Acting Prime Minister who thought it was better, although before he thought it was of no importance. Since then I have met people outside of this House who also thought it was better.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Section 20 provides that all the roads mentioned in Schedule 2, whose charters have expired because they have not been commenced or completed within the time fixed, shall, in some cases, have their charters extended, but mostly revived. What I said was that I had no objection to reviving a charter or to granting an extension of five years for those roads upon which work had been commenced. I also stated that it was not just to grant a revival of a charter without the parties interested or the residents of the territory through which the railway was proposed to be run having an opportunity of being heard before the Railway Committee, or the parties granting the extension. My objection was immediately corroborated by the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. H. A. Mackie) stating that there was a road, the location of which ought, in his opinion, to be changed. The Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) replied to him: If you want to change the location of the road, you will have to get a new charter. I replied to that: If you should get a new charter for a road to run in the same territory, would it not be fair to cancel the original charter? As the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) said just now there would then be none of the duplication of railways, two roads running side by side spoken of by the President of the Council. Is there anything unfair in that? Supposing public opinion and public necessity in the part of the country where a deviation of the road was required further than is allowed by the Railway Act without permission being received from Parliament or new plans being filed—or a new charter, being obtained—if you will and some persons applied for a new charter and showed that they were ready to build the road in a part of the country where it would be required, would it not be fair to cancel the old charter, or let it expire, let it die a natural death, and give an opportunity for building, under the new charter, a road which would be promoted by private interests to serve the better, more populous and richer part of the country? I do not see any disloyalty in that. That is how the whole discussion arose this afternoon.

The ministers say: We cannot go on with the construction of those roads without getting permission from Parliament, and when the estimates are brought down to the House, honourable members can voice their objections. The honourable member for East Edmonton (Mr. H. A. Mackie) objected to that, because there were in