

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly; when the schedule is complete the whole thing is complete, but until the schedule is complete, it is not finally settled. As long as the hon. gentleman admits that when we come to the consideration of the schedule he can decide whether any or all of those contained in the schedule shall be allowed to remain. Then the passing of this clause does not commit us finally to the adoption of the whole schedule.

Mr. BUREAU: Mr. Chairman, you ruled this afternoon that the schedule was to be considered last. I claim this cannot meet the case that we are considering.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The cases are the same.

Mr. BUREAU: My contention is that we base our opinion as to whether we ought to pass this or not on the schedule itself, and we decide whether the charters mentioned therein deserve or do not deserve to be revived or extended. My hon. friend cannot argue that after we have revived all these charters by passing section 20 we can go back and strike out any from the schedule that we do not approve of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is not worded any differently from any other clause that refers to a schedule.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not care how it is worded.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman say I cannot find him a case where the very same wording has been used referring to a schedule, adopting it and where the schedule has not been amended?

Mr. BUREAU: And the schedule omitted?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The schedule not omitted, but considered afterwards, and amended?

Mr. BUREAU: It might not be an identical case.

Mr. CAHILL: The Minister of the Interior seems to be very anxious about the opinions of the country on our attitude towards the Bill. If he is so anxious he might go up to North Ontario, open that constituency and see how the people of Ontario, where they have the hydro-electric—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. VIEN: We have heard from the treasury benches insinuations which are hardly in keeping with the high offices of the gentlemen who have offered them. We have heard the insinuation that the interest we take in this matter is absolutely simulated. These are the exact words used by

the Acting Prime Minister—that we are not trying to safeguard the interests of the people, but that we were simulating. He made another statement which to my mind is as unfortunate—that the gentlemen on this side of the House, when speaking on this matter, were actuated only by the purpose of fostering private interests and particularly the interests of the Canadian Pacific. He also accused the Opposition of unduly delaying the enactment of this clause. The hon. member (Mr. Richardson), speaking after him, said that we were opposed to the extension of time which this clause purports to give for the construction of various branch lines. These insinuations are absolutely unwarranted. The Opposition has a right, and it is its duty, to carefully study the measures brought down by the Government, particularly when we are in Committee of the Whole. This is not the first time in which it has been said that this country had been overburdened with duplicated railway lines. In the Drayton-Acworth report attention is drawn to the fact that we had duplicated railway lines. The Acting Prime Minister in his remarks said that we had overbuilt railways in Canada and that several lines overlap. And yet in the presence of the Drayton-Acworth Report accusing both parties of having overbuilt railways in the presence of the Prime Minister's statement to the effect that lines had been duplicated and were overlapping, the Minister of Railways lays on the Table a schedule which proposes a blanket authorization for forty-four branch lines. We are not objecting to the construction of these lines; we are simply going into the matter carefully.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. VIEN: Some hon. members laugh, but if they will recall what has been said in the House to-day they will realize that the discussion has not been confined to the discussion of clause 20, or of the schedule annexed to it. When the Acting Prime Minister complained that the Opposition was delaying the enactment of this clause he might better have directed his complaints to the Dominion Day patriotic and political rambling of the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). But no, he only had bouquets to offer to that hon. gentleman, giving further ground for the suspicion that political action is contemplated here, and that this section is brought in only for political purposes. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very sensitive to the imputation that they are not always actuated by pub-