

stances my intention is to move to-morrow that when the house adjourns to-morrow, it stand adjourned until Friday at three o'clock.

So that as late as 1934, for the reasons mentioned, the right hon. leader of the opposition thought it was advisable not to sit on Ascension day. In 1935 also, which was last year, the house did not sit on Ascension day. Seeing that such has been the practice, and as apparently we are not immediately near the end of the session, the government has thought it advisable that we should not sit on Ascension day. As to Victoria day, the objection to sitting on that day has usually come from hon. gentlemen opposite; it was made quite vigorously on some previous occasions. The government has also had that in mind in hoping that the house would accept the resolution in the form in which it is expressed.

Mr. BENNETT: I am quite aware of what was said in 1934, but the reason I directed attention to the matter in the terms I did was that the Prime Minister on Friday last mentioned that the government had no views on the matter and were quite willing to sit on either or both of the days in question, and I thought probably it had been discussed before he made that statement. In view of what he has now said, it would appear that it is thought desirable by the government that we should not sit on either day, and that is the end of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I just wish to say to my right hon. friend that I thought the government whip's word had probably covered his party.

Mr. BENNETT: The whips tell me that what I say is exactly what they say. I consulted the whip, and he tells me the statement I made is exactly the view I was asked to present.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Unfortunately it does not cover all the other members of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think that so far as the group in this corner is concerned we should prefer to sit right through.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

APPLICATION OF CANADIAN PACIFIC FOR PROVINCIAL CHARTER FOR ANGLIERS-NORANDA- CHIBOUGAMAU LINE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre): Is the Minister of Railways (Mr. Howe) aware of an attempt being made at the present time by the Canadian Pacific Railway to enter the mineral area of north

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Quebec at present served only by the Canadian government railways, national transcontinental line, by building a line from Angliers into Noranda, and thence easterly paralleling the national transcontinental and crossing it in a northerly direction, and proceeding to lake Chibougamau, the whole of which territory is at present tributary to the Canadian National Railways transcontinental line? If so, will the minister declare that such action by the Canadian Pacific Railway is in breach of both the terms and the spirit of the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Railway Act, which enjoins a policy of cooperation between Canada's two main railway systems; and will the minister take steps to prevent, or endeavour to prevent, such action by the Canadian Pacific Railway with a view to continuing to retain the territory for service by the Canadian National lines which have spent many millions of dollars in pioneering and opening up this highly mineralized area?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Railways and Canals): The government is aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made application to the legislature of Quebec for a charter to build a line as described by my hon. friend. The Canadian National Railways inquired as to the views of the department, and we have instructed the railway to represent the position of the Canadian National Railways as to the granting of a charter. Whether this is a violation of the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Railway Act is a matter of argument. It may be observed that this would bring a third railway into Noranda, which is now served by the Canadian National and Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railways.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Kootenay East): Following that question, may I direct a question to the Minister of Justice? This is a matter of law, and I do not pretend to have any right of judgment in my own mind on the subject; I put it as a layman. Is it competent for a corporation whose work has been declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, and which is thus brought within the jurisdiction of parliament, to achieve its wishes by avoiding an application to parliament and seeking the incorporation of its project by means of a provincial charter, although the incorporators are members of the staff of a federal corporation? Does that proceeding violate the principles of law which govern a federal corporation?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): Will my hon. friend allow his question to remain as notice?

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly.