

convince him that public ownership is all right.

Mr. BUREAU: You could not convert me.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I hope the hon. gentleman will be converted, because he has been perfectly frank in this matter. Do I misrepresent the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie)—do I place that hon. gentleman in an improper position, when I say that by implication he also is opposed to public ownership? I pause for a reply.

Mr. MCKENZIE: All I can say to my hon. friend is that if he will read the Hansard of last session at page 2191 he will see exactly where I stand. There is no mistake about my attitude.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I will look it up later, because I certainly would not wish to state the hon. gentleman's position incorrectly. But what impression must this House and the country gather when leading member after leading member on the Opposition side impliedly takes a stand against public ownership, and, as an hon. gentleman sitting near me suggests, raises every possible obstacle to the passage of this Bill? I am not disposed to criticise the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) for requiring the Bill to be amended in every proper way, but I think I am not going too far in concluding that the Opposition as a body are unfriendly to public ownership, and I want to warn them that if they hope to secure the confidence of this country, and to gain the treasury benches it will not be by means of the policy that they are pursuing on this question.

Now I have been an advocate of public ownership for thirty years. That is a long time, and if I had to offer an excuse for rising to discuss this question to-night, it would be because I listened with pardonable pride and very great satisfaction to the speeches which the leader of the Government and the President of the Privy Council delivered. To me it was a great satisfaction, because it means that the Acting Prime Minister and the party with which he is identified are now declared supporters of the policy of public ownership—in fact those gentlemen told us that a study of the question has brought them to that view. It was estimated, I think by the Minister of Railways, that the surplus on the operation of the Government-owned railways would not be less than \$3,000,000. It is not a large amount but at least it is something and it is no wonder that the

Canadian Pacific Railway Company is looking askance at the policy of public ownership. It seems to me that any member who desires to serve his constituents and the people as a whole must range himself as a supporter of this policy. The leader of the Opposition spoke of the policy of the Laurier party as one of competence and capacity. Let me deal with that claim. When the Liberal party came into office it was on a pledge to wipe out protection from the tariff and to settle satisfactorily the railway question. The West had groaned under the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific and the Liberals for years and years had denounced that company and wanted competition.

Mr. MCKENZIE: I rise to a point of order. I think my good friend is drifting from the subject.

Mr. VIEN: Let the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) sit down.

Mr. MCKENZIE: If the hon. gentleman is going to enter upon a discussion of the tariff we shall never conclude the consideration of this Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON: My reference to it is only incidental, I spoke to the Chairman about the matter, and he said that so much latitude had already been given—the leader of the Opposition himself read a long extract from the Montreal Star, and the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) also quoted extensively—that he would give me every facility. I am really dealing with the railway question. The Liberal party promised reforms with regard to the construction of railroads, but that party spent a billion of dollars of the people's money in constructing a transcontinental railway which in the general opinion of everybody was an entirely unnecessary and superfluous undertaking. It was promised that that road would cost the country in the neighbourhood of \$13,000,000; it has actually cost Canada \$200,000,000—such an enormous amount that I do not think the railway ever possibly can pay. With regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, we listened to the words of the President of the Privy Council this evening, who said that it was a melancholy spectacle to travel through the Northwest Territories—in fact, I called the attention of the leader of the Opposition to it the other day—and see the duplication of railroads that exists. Now, if that is a policy of competence and capacity, it certainly does not appeal to me as such. However I am not anxious to blame one party more than another. I think there is