

to give the information, but to spar the other man out of the ring. This must be somewhat new to the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) whom I see in his seat to-day. The hon. member must recall just a few years ago when he would attempt to speak of public ownership and to advocate the taking over of all transportation lines, vessels, railways and so on. Many times during the course of the last fourteen years I have heard him speak in favour of public ownership. How dumb was the opposite side of the House then, and he would have received no encouragement whatever, were it not for some encouragement he got from this side of the House. He spoke to absolutely deaf ears on the other side; not one man would stand up with him; he could not even present a motion in favour of public ownership supported by one member on the other side of the House. Yet here is the apostle of public ownership in his seat to-day, looking, with all the pleasure that a man can summon up, with the knowledge of converts he has made to the cause, from the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) down to the last man. The Acting Prime Minister said the other day: The whole trouble is that the Opposition are against public ownership, and that is why they are

4 p.m. opposing it. The Acting Prime Minister knows perfectly well

that the question of public ownership versus private ownership has never come up for discussion in concrete form in this House, so that he cannot say who are in favour of public ownership and who are in favour of private ownership. But up to three or four years ago, with the exception of the hon. member for South York, there was not on the other side of the House a man who was in favour of private ownership in this country. Therefore, it ill becomes the Acting Prime Minister to cast any slur upon members seated upon this side on the ground that they are against public ownership. Are we against public ownership because we want some information regarding this Bill? Are we against public ownership because we do not believe that it is the right method to pursue, that the first important Bill brought before the House must be brought before us under the rule of closure?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member has spoken now for twenty minutes. He will be able to continue his remarks on some other clause that comes under consideration.

Mr. DEVLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, because I wish to discuss Clauses 28, 29 and 30.

Mr. CAHILL: I do not wish to express my opinion regarding this "gag" law which the Acting Prime Minister saw fit to bring in on Friday, in lieu of giving information which the Government were either unable or unwilling to furnish to this Committee. The Acting Prime Minister blustered into the Committee about twenty minutes to six o'clock on Friday afternoon when Section 20 of the Bill, a section that had never been printed, that had never been submitted to the Committee before, had been under discussion for less than two hours. At about five minutes to four o'clock, as will be found from Hansard, an amendment was moved to take in some forty or forty-four railroads, and shortly before six o'clock the Acting Prime Minister suggested to the chairman that he call it six o'clock, so that the minister would have an opportunity, at eight o'clock, of making a statement to the Committee for the purpose of endeavouring to cover up the actions of this Government and their nefarious—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CAHILL: Co-operation with the Mackenzie and Mann crowd. It is a cowardly action of a cowardly Government to undertake.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression, as it is certainly not parliamentary.

Mr. CAHILL: I bow to your decision, Sir. I know you will permit no stronger language, and nothing milder will express my feelings in the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. PARENT: They can swallow it.

Mr. CAHILL: They have swallowed so much already; this is nothing new to them. We are debating a Bill to incorporate the Canadian National railways. On Friday at four o'clock in the afternoon the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) brought in an amendment, and I say, without fear of contradiction, that the minister could not at that time have named ten out of the forty railways. I will challenge any minister of the Government to name, without looking up Hansard, the places where any of those railways start and finish. They cannot do it, because they do not know. The Bill