

Transcontinental railway. What was that arrangement made at Dundee? My hon. friend will remember that it was an arrangement by which the Canadian Northern let the Grand Trunk Pacific bring its grain and run its trains down there to get to the head of lake Superior pending the completion of their road. While that was all right as a temporary arrangement, it was wholly unfitted for a through line such as the Transcontinental, and if I had had to deal with this matter again, and again, and again, I would have taken the very same position and I am prepared to defend it anywhere in the Dominion of Canada.

I am not surprised at the acting Minister of Railways—being, like myself, a kind of a farmer lawyer—getting mixed up in statutes; but these commissioners, one of whom is a great lawyer, got tangled up in the statutes themselves, that is, if they did not do it wilfully. The commissioners charge that the Transcontinental Commission, contrary to the statute, built a double-track line in one or two or three places; and, in the canned material sent out by somebody to the press, the statute is referred to, chapter 71, Edward VII, and the report says that, contrary to the statute, this double track was constructed. Will the Solicitor General find me where it says single-track in that agreement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member charge that I sent out that report?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all; but I want my hon. friend to know that his commission misrepresented the law. My hon. friend is too honourable to stand by that. He knows what the statute is, and he knows that there is not a line in it in saying that it was illegal to build the two tracks. The statute everywhere refers to a line of railway. So far as legal standing is concerned, it might be one, two, three, four, five or six tracks; it would depend altogether on the agreement. But when these gentlemen ask us to take their report as a complete report and deliberately misrepresent the statute, I say that we are not going beyond our rights when we demand that the Government disown such a report as not being truthful, to put it very mildly.

I observe, Sir, that there is not a dissenting voice to my statement that when these commissioners, in this report, said it was contrary to the statute to build a double track for three, four, five or six miles, they were deliberately stating what was not in the statute at all. But I go further. Suppose it were in the statute, then this commission would be just as far wrong, though not as deliberately wrong, and we would not have had the record to prove the misleading character of what they have put in their report. Everything necessary to the operation of a railway line is provided for under that statute, and if it be necessary to have a double track from their yards at any point to a station at any other convenient point, that comes under the statute, even if it had said a single-track railway. Men who are practical, and who are not looking for the thin edge of the wedge on some technicality to put into this argument, I want you to pay some attention for a moment if you will. Here are the