

and easterly direction on the north side of the North Saskatchewan river to St. Paul de Metis, and thence to the eastern boundary of the province of Alberta. We were told this afternoon by the hon. member for Edmonton that certain subsidies were granted to that road and that the subsidies had not been used, or that bonds had been issued and the proceeds not used for the construction of the road. Is that correct?

Mr. J. D. REID: The bonds were guaranteed and part of them, if not all, were sold. The money is in the bank and will not be expended except on the certificate of the engineer. Part of the road has been built, and it is necessary to have the charter renewed.

Mr. BUREAU: I am willing that the extension should be granted.

Mr. J. D. REID: In the case of almost all the charters that have been mentioned some work has actually been done, and if we do not renew the charters an asset of the Canadian Railway system will be lost.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: When was this money deposited in the bank?

Mr. J. D. REID: I cannot say exactly.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: My information is that it was deposited in the bank in 1912, and if that is the case, why has not the line been constructed?

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly the money should have been expended by this time.

Mr. J. D. REID: They have not gone on with railway construction during the war.

Mr. BUREAU: The money was deposited apparently two years before the war.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am prepared to give all the details the House wants when the Estimates come up, but I have not the information here to-night. We simply wish to have these charters renewed.

Mr. BUREAU: I am willing that every charter on which work has been commenced should be renewed.

Mr. KEEFER: There are only about four on which work has not been commenced.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not fair to revive a charter when no work has been done, without giving the public a chance to make any objections they may have. It may be in the public interest that those objections should be heard.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. KEEFER: I think it would be eminently fair to revive them, and why? The very clause says that it is only those charters which but for the war would not have expired.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no.

Mr. KEEFER: Yes, that is one way of expressing it. Section 20 says:

The times for the commencement and completion of the construction of any lines of railway . . . which had not expired at the beginning of the war.

These only are the ones we are renewing. If we did not have that clause any one could take advantage of the existing condition of affairs during the war. We do not allow all that in mortgages and so forth, because we have a moratorium. Why not apply the same principle here? The Government is thoroughly honest in the matter. We are taking over these assets under the stock of this company, and the leader of the Opposition says: "Why not give this company a free hand?" The answer is, if you do not give them the assets they have not a free hand—which is what we are seeking to give them.

Mr. BUREAU: I am willing to give them all the chances where work has been commenced.

Mr. KEEFER: Did my hon. friend notice what the clause says about the war?

Mr. BUREAU: Let me read the amendment:

The times for the commencement and completion of the construction of the lines of railway specified in the second schedule to this Act which any of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System were authorized to construct are hereby extended for two years and five years respectively after the passing of this Act.

Some of these charters that are being extended were dead before the war. In some cases extensions were granted by Federal statutes, which allowed one year in which construction was to begin and three years in which to finish. Now the Canadian Pacific, when they asked for extensions during the same period, were granted two years in which to commence and five years in which to finish; the Federal statutes show that. So there must have been some reason why the Canadian Pacific was given two and five years, whereas the Canadian Northern was given only one and three. I do not know whether the reason for specifying one and three years in the case of the Canadian Northern was that no work had been done, but there