

diate command of Canadian Railway Construction battalions, Major-General Stewart was appointed Director of Construction, his duties embracing all construction of a railway engineering character in the zone of the British armies. The following table shows the comparative strength of the Imperial and Canadian Railway Construction Forces on the western front as at the dates given:

Date.	Nominal Strength Imperial Railway Construction Troops.	Nominal Strength Canadian Railway Construction Troops.
Dec. 31, 1915 . . .	2,440	512
Dec. 31, 1916 . . .	4,900	1,617
Jan. 30, 1917 . . .	7,340	11,562
Dec. 31, 1917 . . .	7,340	13,772
Nov. 11, 1918 . . .	7,340	14,877

The control of all the railway construction operations in France was largely in the hands of Major General J. W. Stewart. In addition to the railway troops I have mentioned, there were four Canadian Railway Troops Operating Companies, with a strength of 1,087 on November 11, 1918. The total strength of Canadian railway troops in England when the armistice was signed was 3,364. During their career at the front the personnel of the Corps of Canadian Railway Troops were awarded 489 honours and decorations.

Mr. PEDLOW: Did the minister keep a record of the men who returned during the fall of 1917 to engage in the elections in Canada?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I did not happen to be minister at that time.

Mr. PEDLOW: Would not a record be kept of these men?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I could not say offhand.

Mr. PEDLOW: The figures are not embodied in this report?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: No. The record of the Canadian Forestry Corps is one we have every reason to be proud of. Their service has been very highly appreciated and favourably commented upon by the Imperial authorities, including the Secretary of State for War.

Mr. PEDLOW: I understood the minister to say that he was overseas from 1914 onwards.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: My hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) was Minister of Militia at that time. Later Sir George Perley was the Minister of Militia Over-

seas. I went over late in 1917, just before the election.

Mr. PEDLOW: The reason why—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Hon. members seem to overlook the fact that the House is not in committee. There has been a series of questions and interruptions which were certainly out of order, and I must ask hon. members to refrain from further interruptions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is a friendly chat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Friendly chats across the floor are absolutely out of order.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I endorse your ruling, Sir, most heartily. I was going on to say that the Canadian Forestry Corps under the command of Maj.-General Alex. McDougall, C. B., deserves very great credit, indeed, for the splendid service it has rendered. The time at my disposal does not permit me to make as lengthy remarks on these organizations as I should like, but I wish to give these figures. On November 11, 1918, the total strength of the Canadian Forestry Corps in France, including prisoners of war attached to units, was 18,240.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Prisoners of war attached to Canadian units?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: We had thirteen companies of prisoners of war, totalling 5,021 men, attached to the Forestry Corps in France when the armistice was signed. In the British Isles at the same date the strength of the Forestry Corps, including 1,265 prisoners and 1,182 other attached men, was 13,207. The grand total in France and the British Isles of the Canadian Forestry Corps when the armistice was signed was 31,447.

The Forestry Corps saved the situation to a great extent in regard to shipping. Lumber is a very bulky freight and through the efforts of the Canadians, who understood forestry work and knew how to attain the best results, an entirely new situation was brought about. In 1913 Britain imported 11,600,000 tons of timber and lumber. This was reduced in 1916 to 6,000,000 tons, in 1917 to 2,775,000 tons, and in 1918 to 2,000,000 tons. So that the difference between 11,600,000 tons in 1913 and 2,000,000 tons in 1918 is almost entirely due to the work of the Canadian Forestry Corps who supplied the difference from home-grown timber. If they had not been as enthusiastic as they were, besides being capable and efficient, that much more shipping would have had to be engaged in the carrying of timber and lumber instead of being released