

Star, in its editorials, was plainly that the opportunity was an opportunity to prove the absolute impossibility of governmental ownership in this country, and if my friends are sincere in what they are about to undertake I would counsel them not to have very many gentlemen speak along the lines followed by the hon. member for Pictou, unless they want to be put in the position that they are absolutely and entirely sure that trouble will be made in the United States, so that they will have some excuse for getting out of the obligation which they owe to the people of this country.

There was another thing said by my hon. friend, the Prime Minister. He blamed us on this side of the House for our unsympathetic handling of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I wonder what on earth he meant by "unsympathetic" handling of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Good heavens, Mr. Speaker, this country was being bled white to look after that baby! Did he want millions more thrown away to keep it going? How much more ought we to have given it? Mr. Speaker, there are some projects so far removed from reason that the most reckless expenditure would be insufficient to save them. Some day perhaps we may have an asset in the Grand Trunk Pacific; but we have not to-day. Yet we are charged with being unsympathetic. We here are only interested, and I think I can speak in this connection for every member on this side of the House, in seeing that the property of the people of Canada gets a fair chance. We know that it is so easy to stifle and kill the project that frankly we are afraid a good deal will be made of the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou. In answer to his remarks to-day I read calculations given to the House by the Minister of Finance at the inception of the Grand Trunk Pacific project. Now our vote last year on that account, if I remember rightly, was \$26,000,000. Yet the whole cost of the undertaking, according to the figures given by the Minister of Finance at its inception—I am sure they were not his own figures but were supplied him by the railway—was to be \$13,000,000, just half the necessary vote taken in the

9 p.m. House last year. It is wonderful what railway people can do with figures. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you have read the award in the present Grand Trunk arbitration. If you have read it you will have some idea of what railway officials can do with figures. As to

the question of figures used by the Grand Trunk, some very harsh things have been said, but I prefer to take what their own arbitrator—not the arbitrator appointed by the Government or the third arbitrator—but what their own arbitrator says. On page 58 of the Award—I will cut the reading down as much as possible—he says:

In 1913 the operating revenues were improperly increased apparently in order to justify the declaration of a dividend on the three series of preferred stocks, a full dividend on the first and second, and half on the third. Then came a period in which the London management was anxious to induce the Canadian Government to take the burden of the Grand Trunk Pacific off its back, on the ground that obligation to run and finance the Pacific Road might lead to the bankruptcy of the Grand Trunk. That led the London management to understate their operating revenues and charge the Audit Office Fund during the years 1915, 1916 and 1917 with an aggregate of nearly eight million dollars that should have appeared as additional revenue.

In 1919 and 1920, when the sale of the road to the Government was being faced as the best course, manipulation of the accounts was directed to making the financial condition of the road seem better than it was.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, wonderful things can be done by people who juggle figures and who do not seem to care very much as to the accuracy of the reports they sign.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I take it that he agrees entirely with my remarks.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, certainly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it that he has not in view, perhaps has never heard of, the statement that was made use of in the campaign in West York in connection with the Grand Trunk employees, a statement that was used well in the interests of my hon. friend's party. It was to the effect that a promise had been given Mr. Kelley, either that he would be left in control of the Grand Trunk system, that the Grand Trunk system would not be taken over, or else that he would be put in charge of the National roads. I wonder if that is what my hon. friend was thinking of when he said "Hear, hear,"—if he meant that so far as he was concerned he was going to see that no gentlemen that had anything to do with the deception worked on the people of this country by these reports shall have anything to do with the management of the people's roads. I take it that that is what his "Hear, hear" meant. We still hope, Mr. Speaker that the chance given will be, not a chance to make certain failure of the roads, but