

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not say anything with reference to the report; I spoke with reference to statements made to the House by the minister. The statement was that the hon. minister did not believe the statement he made himself.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS: He never said that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to say that it is the Speaker's judgment that must prevail in a ruling of this kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh; we will appeal.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the ruling is objected to, there may be an appeal from it; but I shall exercise the right that the Speaker has to see that the rules of debate are observed.

Mr. GRAHAM: I submit in fairness that I have not made statements of that kind. I am sure the minister will agree with me that I never thought of saying such a thing.

Mr. REID: Go ahead.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was pointing out that not only was the policy of all the big companies to let these great works to large contractors of responsibility but that these contracts were sub-let. Then I was stating—

Some hon. MEMBERS: It is nearly midnight; ask to adjourn.

Other hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the ruling of the Chair should be respected, and to say 'go on' in defiance of that is certainly disputing the order of the Chair, and puts one saying so in the judgment of the House as acting improperly.

Mr. CARVELL: I suppose that. Your Honour is referring to me. I was telling the hon. gentleman to ask to adjourn the House. I was not disputing your ruling.

Mr. GAUVREAU: But more than that, I heard the minister say 'go on.'

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I heard the statement, 'go on.'

Mr. BOIVIN: The Minister of Railways said, 'go on.'

Mr. GAUVREAU: Will you allow me only a minute?

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Any member has a right to rise to a point of order; but it is his duty, when the Speaker is on his feet, to remain seated.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I was only going to ask you to allow me to say a word. I heard the minister himself say to the ex-Minister of Railways, "go on." If you did not hear him, it is not my fault.

Some hon. MEMBERS: We all heard him.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think we have got the matter pretty well cleared up now. I have tried absolutely to avoid imputing anything to the minister in the nature of not believing what he said. This is an item in the report to which the minister, I think, made no reference. I was not dealing at all with what the minister said, but with what I found in this report.

I have dealt with some companies and some of the acts of this Government, and I was going to take one other work of this Government. The two last sections of the Hudson Bay railways were let by this Government to J. D. McArthur. It was a very large contract, up in the millions, and this work was sub-let by McArthur. I am not criticising that at all. It is the only possible way in which great works can be carried on, but I am saying that it is not fair for a report to be circulated charging the previous Administration, or the late commission, with wasting \$8,000,000 through sub-contracting, when this Government is doing the very same thing in regard to the Hudson Bay railway.

I have given a great many authorities on grades, some of them indisputable, and I am now going to give another authority that my hon. friend will not dispute. The word 'virtual' is not in this at all, but that word did deceive the Secretary of the Board of Trade of the city of Quebec. While he was thinking of the word 'maximum', it was the word 'virtual' that was being used. What does this report say in conclusion? Gutelius is now on his own stumping ground and sees through the spectacles of an operator of a railway, and not through the spectacles of a paid commissioner. He is dealing with his own line and not with the Grand Trunk Pacific. He expressed himself in very plain English. This time, undoubtedly, he has thrown aside the garb of commissioner; he wants what is best for the Intercolonial railway in order to make its operation easier and more profitable. On page 138 of the report he says: