

way of special statute when it is a fixed charge of a permanent nature, or by an item in the estimates voted annually. In both cases the destination of the money must be described; the specific purpose for which the money is to be used must be shown to the legislative body. This is a principle so elementary that its soundness cannot successfully be contradicted. As I said yesterday, even during the war when the special session was called for the purpose of voting an amount of £50,000,000 to allow Canada to enter the war the Prime Minister of the day gave a list of the destinations of the sums included in this particular grant. There were the naval expenditures in connection with the Niobe and the Rainbow; there was the purchase of a new submarine and the pay of 25,000 men. There was the payment for rations for the army, and the expenditure necessary for the purchase of 5,000 horses. The Prime Minister of that day was asked to outline these details. And even with that somewhat incomplete protection there were abuses at that time; some of the moneys which were voted were used for purposes other than those for which they should have been used. Why should we take any chance or risk at the present time? We are not given one single piece of information as to any particular public work which the government intends to initiate. Surely my hon. friend has some in mind. Even if he could not recite all the public works he wishes to have undertaken by the aid of the money to be voted in this bill, he must have some particular works in mind. As members of this House of Commons and as representatives of the Canadian people we certainly have a right to the confidence of my friend in that regard, and he should give us some of the information for which we are asking.

As far as the Canadian National Railways estimates are concerned I think my hon. friend from Rimouski (Sir Eugène Fiset), who was the chairman of the special committee, has dealt with that very fully. All the information was given every year. As to advances to harbour boards, mentioned by my hon. friend this afternoon, may I say that those moneys were merely loaned; they were not voted for expenses in the way suggested by this present legislation.

Mr. BENNETT: The then Minister of Finance said the Quebec moneys would never come back. Does my hon. friend remember that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Some of my hon. friends on the other side of the house have always

had a sore spot in connection with the money voted for Quebec.

Mr. BENNETT: The then Minister of Finance said that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am surprised that my hon. friend has mentioned that. I very well remember the difficulty we had to get the money for the harbour board of Quebec; every item had to be given to the house. Not only was that the case in connection with Quebec, but the Montreal and other harbour boards had to give full information. A full program had to be outlined before the money was voted by parliament. I must say that this is absolutely a new venture in the matter of dealing with the finances of Canada. Let me tell my hon. friend that even the Montreal Gazette, that good old Conservative organ—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: On the day of the opening of parliament the Montreal Gazette stated that it was the duty of the opposition to ask for all information about the money which was to be appropriated by this legislation. I am going to read from the Gazette of Monday, September 8. May I say that the Gazette was most generous in heaping flowery phrases upon my hon. friend.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I do not think the hon. gentleman can properly read an outside paper during the present debate.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh, I think—

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is a rule of the house.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh no, it is being done all the time.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not say it is not being done, but I say it is not the rule.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is, surely. It is in support of my argument.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will allow me I shall quote paragraph 306 from the book of Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the house and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the house.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But that is not what I am going to do. I am giving the opinion of the Montreal Gazette on a matter of policy.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is here to give his own opinion, not anybody else's.