

tion of being partial to the principles of public ownership.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As my hon. friend is giving us what he calls extracts, I would like him to quote what Lord Shaughnessy said. The statement of Lord Shaughnessy at the Canadian National Exhibition at Toronto contained the following words—I am quoting from memory:—

I would not pretend to oppose the Government ownership of railways. What I am asking is that before embarking on this new venture we should be sure of our footing.

That is what Lord Shaughnessy said.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not contradict my hon. friend. This is what is said of Lord Shaughnessy by the Toronto Globe on April 23, 1919:—

The other antagonist of railway nationalization is Lord Shaughnessy who challenges the politicians and the officials of the Government railway service. The officials he says will ultimately become politicians and he adds ironically that Cabinet ministers soon become efficient railway men.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have here the exact words spoken by Lord Shaughnessy, and I will read them so as to do no injustice to him.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What was the occasion of that speech?

Mr. LEMIEUX: He was speaking at the opening of the Canadian National Exhibition on August 26, 1918.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The reference I cited was apparently to a different occasion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He said this:—

We shall, within the next short period, have an opportunity to learn the result of our neighbor's management of the railways of the country and probably have a little experience of our own. I do not wish to have it understood that I am taking an attitude opposed to nationalization of railways. When the Government is satisfied that the people of this country want nationalization, we are a democratic people and we shall have it. But whatever our policy, we should be very sure of our footing or it may become a very serious problem.

That is what I quoted to the House.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I was quoting the reference to a different occasion, viz., April 23, 1919, as reported by the Toronto Globe. My hon. friend further quoted Mr. Mitchell, president of the National City Company of New York. Mr. Mitchell stated that the cost was too great and that therefore in the United States the "popular fashion for Government ownership and operation has materially cooled during the

past year." The hon. member for Maison-neuve also gave the views of the greatest authority on economics in Europe, according to his opinion, who was "absolutely opposed to public ownership." Having done this, he asks the members to pause before committing themselves to "this fancy" adding that "the best friends of the Government" in the city of Toronto were opposed to "this very policy." I submit that the hon. member for Maison-neuve came out as a strong opponent of public ownership. Then, we come to the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). One thing I always like about the hon. member for Three Rivers is that he is downright outspoken; there is nothing equivocal about him. He comes out on one side or the other.

Mr. McCREA: He is always intelligent.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: His words are always intelligible and nobody will accuse the hon. member of lack of intelligence. He says:

I am against public ownership; I have stated so.

Hansard, page 1820, of the present session. At page 1822 he says again:

I happen to be against public ownership. I stated on the second reading that I was against it; that I was in favour of private ownership and public control.

Then at page 1825 he says:

I want my good friends to see that in spite of my opposition to public ownership I want to help the system as much as I can.

The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), who is a tower of strength in his party, said at page 1818:

Those who believe that nationalization means necessarily liberty and freedom are mistaken. In many respects it is the very opposite of liberty. Its purpose is to kill competition and erect a bureaucratic state.

I put forward these citations as representing the views of hon. gentlemen opposite because it was stated that hon. members opposite were not opposed to the principles of public ownership.

As I stated I have no objection whatever to a public man being in favour of private as opposed to public ownership. But it is essential to know what a public man's views are; and in the case of a party in this House, to know what their views are upon the subject. I submit that, from the quotations which I have read, it is perfectly clear that the leaders of hon. gentlemen opposite are opposed to the principle of public ownership.