

with railway construction in this country, the growth of railway mileage exceeding by ten to one the growth of the population. The report suggested that there should be a stay in the building of railways for many years to come.

Another question that may be asked is whether these bills are in order. Ordinarily bills are brought down and read in the House the first, second and third times. The rules provide that before a bill is introduced there must be on the reverse side of the bill a proper explanation of its purposes and the details of the proposal involved, but that is not done in this case. I think this is a matter that should be looked into.

The National Railways system has 22,000 miles of single track now; the resolution proposes to build another thousand miles. You have a merchant marine; what do they do? They are sitting in with the railways in the matter of rates; are they going to sit in with these branch lines in the same way? I suppose they will keep the charges up there as well, and no doubt the Railway Commission will not be heard from in that case either. As a friend of public ownership I am afraid that public ownership will not be given a chance if the construction of branch lines is to go on as proposed—twenty-nine millions now, twenty-five or

9 p.m. twenty-six millions next year—why, branch lines will sooner or later with their deficits act as the hangman for the National Railways. During the last three years \$400,000,000 has been spent on rolling stock and equipment for the National Railways, and in view of that fact it seems to me that they should have made a better showing. I think they would have made just as good a showing if the present president of the National Railways had never been born. Furthermore, I do not know of any position in the British Empire to-day that cannot be filled by a native Briton. We have an official in Toronto a Briton, Mr. H. H. Couzens, head of the Toronto Transportation Commission, who is leaving that city to-morrow to take a position with a railway company at St. Paul at \$50,000 a year. We have Canadian engineers, such as Mr. F. A. Gaby and Mr. Acres, who built the Chippewa canal. There is nothing the British born cannot accomplish in big public undertakings.

No one individual is responsible for any showing that may be made by the National Railways. The government gave the president every support, but with the large expenditure on rolling stock, the improved busi-

[Mr. Church.]

ness conditions and the carrying out of policies inaugurated by the old board we find that the credit is not all attributable to the president of the system.

I am not saying that Nova Scotia does not need some of these branch line facilities, but I would point out that in the counties of Ontario and Durham there has been an absolute waste of public money in connection with Canadian National Railways. Between Toronto and Cobourg there are four railway lines, the old Grand Trunk, with double track, running from Toronto to Port Hope and Cobourg; the Canadian Pacific, the old Canadian Northern, and the Toronto Eastern—four railways where there is not enough business for one with a double track. Yet they are going to squander money on continuing with the old Toronto Eastern, a road that in my opinion should never have become a steam radial. That policy of the Canadian National board has been condemned by the Globe newspaper, The Port Hope Guide and other Liberal organs in the Toronto district. If this branch line programme is a sample of the recommendations of the Canadian National directors, the sooner Canada gets a brand new board of directors the better. This legislation is brought down in a haphazard manner, without proper information and without any consideration of how the construction of these branch lines will affect transportation costs throughout Canada. If this is the way we are to proceed then we shall wait in vain for reduced taxation, the statement to be announced in the budget statement of the Acting Finance Minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not going to reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Church) as he has two resolutions on the order paper that he was discussing, except to say that men who, like a good many of us, have all the railways they can use, and more too, and who can reach the railway station in five minutes from their door, and by street car, should not lecture people who have not a railway within thirty or forty miles.

My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) questioned my statement about the Aid to Agriculture Act. I was absolutely right, and the estimate in his hand showed that I was right.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Caught him again.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am going to take the statute of 1919; that cannot be blamed on the present government. Hon. gentlemen know that when money is voted by statute it only appears in the estimates as a record, and is not voted upon in the House at all;