

is an essential part of any harmonious and effective plan of nationalizing railways.

Mr. PARENT: Will the hon. gentleman tell me what paper he is quoting from, and the translation of the extract?

Mr. HOCKEN: I am quoting from a translation in the Montreal Gazette. Will the hon. gentleman accept that?

Mr. PARENT: What is the date?

Mr. HOCKEN: Unfortunately, I have not the date; it is Tuesday.

Mr. PARENT: You should make it clearer.

Mr. HOCKEN: I have cut out the extract from the Gazette and it reads:

It would seem unbelievable that at the present time when Canada is weighed down with an enormous debt and finds it difficult to meet her financial engagements, and especially when we are obliged to contract a further loan of \$350,000,000—

Mr. PARENT: It must be a bad translation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. HOCKEN: I am not responsible for the translation. I am giving it to the committee as I have it.

—in order to meet our war obligations, and when we have before our eyes the unfortunate railway venture of the United States, that anyone should dare speak of buying the Grand Trunk system, thus increasing the public debt by several hundred million dollars more at the present time.

That is the attitude of the chief Liberal organ in Quebec and it is only in harmony with the position taken by most speakers on the other side. As far as I can judge, the purchase of the Grand Trunk railway is an essential part of any undertaking to make profitable what we now have, and I hope that the Government will take it over. The Grand Trunk in Ontario and Quebec, joined up with the Canadian Northern in the western provinces, will make a better transcontinental system than the Canadian Pacific railway; and if the party represented by hon. gentlemen opposite had pursued that policy instead of putting \$550,000,000 into another transcontinental railway we would not be in the dilemma in which we find ourselves to-day, and the Grand Trunk might still remain under private ownership. But there were men connected with that enterprise who thought they saw a big thing in it. We know how sadly disappointed they were. And there were certain people, too, who thought it would be a great achieve-

[Mr. Hocken.]

ment to enhance their reputation. So that it was carried out at the expense of the country and we are forced into the present position by necessity. I stand here to declare myself in support of public ownership and the nationalization of railways, and I hope the time will come when the Canadian Pacific, along with the rest, will be nationalized. What we have at present should be put on a sound basis, and the next thing is to take over the Grand Trunk and incorporate that with the National Railway system. After we have reached that point we might consider how much further we should go.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I want to say to the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat that the issue, as some of us understand it, between public ownership of railways and ownership by Mackenzie and Mann. We on this side are in favour of public ownership, but we want real, genuine, clean ownership, divorced altogether from any influence on the part of Mackenzie and Mann. The hon. member and some gentlemen around him seem to favour a peculiar kind of public ownership under the control of Mackenzie and Mann, but to this proposition we on this side are absolutely opposed. We have been discussing this Bill for some time, wrestling with my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Justice in an endeavour to have it improved, but he has not given us any information and has declined to consider any of the proposals that we have put forward. There are in the Bill a few clauses that we are especially opposed to, and we have offered a number of amendments but they have been rejected. My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has hardened his heart and refused to listen to us and that is why there is such a desperate struggle over the Bill. If we received the information to which, as representatives of the people, we are justly entitled, and if the minister were disposed to consider the amendments which we think ought to be accepted, I do not think there would be any necessity to resort to the closure under rule 17B in regard to the passing of the Bill by the House. We are asked to revive 44 defunct charters of which we know nothing. Many of them have been passed by the legislature at Regina, and many others by the legislature at Edmonton. They have never been before this House, and hon. members know nothing about them. We asked for the route that the railways are to take, a map for example, showing what part of the country they are supposed to serve,