

that we have heard discussed in this House from time to time this session.

Mr. NESBITT. I would not have said anything on the subject had not the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), made the statement that I was opposed to public ownership, because I asked him a question. I did not say that I was opposed to public ownership, but I do say now that I am opposed to any hon. member taking up the time of the House in talking about some fad, talking in generalities and making a lot of statements in support of which he is not prepared to produce one title of evidence. I asked the hon. gentleman a question about Denmark, but I doubt whether he knows anything more about that country than he knows about Manitoba, and that is nothing. Even if they do have rural telephones and telegraphs in Denmark for seven dollars, it does not take very much of a telegraph line to cover the whole burg. Besides that, I doubt, as I said before, whether he knows anything about what they do in Denmark.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Thank you.

Mr. NESBITT. I am opposed to general statements being made without producing facts before a lot of business men such as we are supposed to be in this House.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Hear, hear.

Mr. NESBITT. The hon. gentleman talked about cable rates, but he wandered over many subjects, and it is surprising that he did not touch upon aviation before he concluded. He certainly talked a lot about building railways, and that has no connection with cables.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Hear, hear.

Mr. NESBITT. I would not have spoken if the hon. gentleman had not stated that I was opposed to public ownership. I am opposed to public ownership if it is not carried on in a business way. Talk about carrying a thing for nothing, the state cannot do business for nothing any more than can a private corporation. As a matter of fact in regard to telephones the Manitoba authorities had to arrange their rates.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I did not say they had not done so. I said I admitted it.

Mr. NESBITT. You said you did not know anything about it, which I can quite believe. I would like to emphatically endorse what my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) said, as to what the farmers are interested in. The farmers of Ontario, in common with those of the other provinces, help to pay the taxes and they are

Mr. LALOR.

making no grumble over it. They are paying their fair proportion and they would like to share in some of the benefits resulting from the progress of the country. I hope the Postmaster General will follow up the policy which was inaugurated by his predecessor and make a point of seeing that the farmers get rural mail delivery in a systematic way.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I would like to say a few words with reference to the motion now before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has exhausted his right to speak a second time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Surely, Mr. Speaker, I have not exhausted my right to speak with reference to the amendment which the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has presented to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The original motion is for the Speaker to leave the Chair in order that the House may go into Committee of Supply, to which the hon. gentleman has already spoken. An amendment has been moved now, and I think the hon. member having expressed himself on the original motion, it would not be in order for him to speak again.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). But this is supposed to be an amendment is it not? Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that I have not the privilege of speaking to the amendment offered by the member for Rouville?

Mr. PELLETIER. Perhaps I may be allowed to make a suggestion. The motion to go into Committee of Supply was made by the Minister of Finance, and my hon. friend from East Lambton, (Mr. Armstrong) spoke to that without proposing any resolution. Then the member for Rouville presented an amendment to the main motion, and I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that by the rules of the House, a new question is before the House on the amendment. I should therefore, think that the hon. member for East Lambton would have the right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. Following the usual practice, the hon. member would have the right to speak, but, unless my memory is very much in fault, it has been ruled in this House that when a motion is made to go into Committee of Supply, and an hon. gentleman has once spoken, on it, he has not the right to speak again upon an amendment to that motion. Personally, I am not opposed to any hon. member speaking, but I would like as far as possible, to facilitate the work of the House, and keep members within the customary usages. Of course, if it is the pleasure of the House to allow the hon. gentleman to proceed, I have no objection whatever.