

miles of it running from Quebec eastward, which part is a paying proposition, and then they drop in behind that again and go from there to Murray Bay where the road will not pay and is not even constructed,—and they want to pay \$3,255,845 for it.

Mr COCHRANE: We will pay what the judge says. I have made that statement several times in the House. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) will bear me out in that.

Mr. CARVELL: I would oppose that with greater vehemence than I would any other scheme that has been proposed here for years, because that is the one thing for which there is no justification as a matter of principle. When they take that attitude they get away to some extent from the absolute position in which the judge places them. With that judgment staring them in the face, I do not see how they can possibly take over the whole system. Finding themselves up against that stone wall, they must stand by Sir Rodolphe Forget and get him out of the difficulty in which he is placed. They abandon the other part of the road because they cannot help themselves on account of the Cassels judgment, but they say: Notwithstanding the statute of 1916, notwithstanding the finding of Mr. Justice Cassels, we are going to pay Sir Rodolphe Forget for a road which has not yet been constructed.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Does my hon. friend not know that besides Sir Rodolphe Forget there are 60,000 people in that district who for two hundred years have been without railway accommodation?

Mr. CARVELL: I should not be surprised to know that. Along the river St. John in my province, the people were without railway facilities for 125 or 130 years.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Have they railway accommodation now?

Mr. CARVELL: We built a railway ourselves. We made a mess of it, but we built it just the same—we did not get it from this Government. I do not argue that a railway along the north shore of the St. Lawrence is not a necessity; a railway is a necessity wherever people live. I should be glad indeed to see the people on the north shore of the St. Lawrence have a railway. But I am pointing out the facts, the Government propose to buy this railway and to leave it to the Exchequer Court to assess the value. His decision makes it impossible for them to carry

[Mr. Carvell.]

out their original intention. The minister now proposes to put through a vote to buy a roadbed, a right of way, which has not upon it even the proverbial two streaks of rust; he is going to spend perhaps \$2,500,000 or \$3,000,000 on it at a time, as set forth by the member for Kingston, when no unnecessary expenditure should be made. There is no doubt that the railway would be a convenience, but I cannot conceive upon what ground the Minister of Railways proposes to go on with an expenditure of this kind under present conditions. I have pleasure in seconding the motion of the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) that this item be struck out.

Mr. COCHRANE: There is no question in the minds of members of the Committee who know anything about this railway that the line is absolutely necessary. I admit that this is a very inopportune time to take action in the matter, but I point out that the railway was pretty well constructed before the commencement of the war and the action of the waves along the shore has been gradually destroying the roadbed. Last year the Government, in its wisdom, made an agreement with Sir Rodolphe Forget and his company for the taking over of these three roads, leaving to the Exchequer Court the determination of the value. The member for Carleton has made a great deal of capital out of the findings of the Exchequer Court. I find no fault with the decisions that have been arrived at. I have several times made the statement that we do not propose to pay anything except what the Exchequer Court awards. If I had my way I would buy the Saguenay road only, and complete it. We did do some riprap work this year along where the contractors had built before; they had riprapped with earth and it was being washed away. The only fault I have to find with the Exchequer Court's decision is this: the judge might have allowed a reasonable amount of interest for construction time. The member for Carleton will admit, I think, that that is railway practice. If he reads the evidence taken before the judge, he will agree that this interest should have been allowed. More than three years' interest, however, could not be allowed, because three years is a reasonable time within which the company could complete the road. We do not propose to pay Sir Rodolphe Forget one dollar of this money until the new Parliament meets and a Bill is submitted for the taking over of the Quebec and Saguenay road, the value to be left to the decision of the Exchequer