

that is doing that to be spreading a report charging that another government had wasted \$8,000,000 in doing what they are doing every day. Let me take another instance: I will take even the Welland canal, not a railway at all.

Mr. McCURDY: The hon. member referred to the Deans-Dartmouth railway. Can he tell the House when the contract for that railway was awarded to the Davis firm?

Mr. GRAHAM: The contract was awarded before the last election.

Mr. McCURDY: By which Government?

Mr. GRAHAM: By myself, and I probably would have had it built by this had I remained in power. But that does not alter my contention, and, as my hon. friend knows the sub-letting is being recognized every day since on that line; and some of the sub-contracts, I venture to say, were let after this Government came into power. There is no doubt about that. My hon. friend is not going to condemn sub-contracting is he? Let him get after the acting Minister of Railways and Canals—

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend should have asked the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) whether or not he had also let a contract to build a railway in Guysborough county. He also suppressed the fact when this Government came in they ratified the contract with Davis, and cancelled the contract for the railway in the county of Guysborough.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Government could have cancelled the contracts with M. P. Davis just as they did the other to which my hon. friend has referred. The two contracts were let at the same time, they could have said: You must not sub-let. But this Government is not made up of men who do not know anything, they knew that was business and the contracts were sub-let.

Now, I come to the Welland canal, not a railway at all; contracts which were let a few weeks ago have sub-contractors on them now, under the chief contractor, and it is let in large sections too. What has my hon. friend to say to the report of sub-letting? He does not believe this twaddle. No member of the Government does.

An hon. MEMBER: Let them say so.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why, they do say so; their practice every day says they do not believe it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to say, that it is not parliamentary to impute improper motives to the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The best authorities say emphatically that it is improper to impute motives, and to say that the Government do not believe what they have presented to the House and what they are standing by is—

Mr. GAUVREAU: It is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. That is to say, they are misleading the House, and that is improper. I hold in my hand Mr. Peel's decisions on this point. I might read several of them if it were necessary; but I only refer to the matter because I think the hon. member perhaps did it unintentionally.

Mr. GRAHAM: In the first place, not a member of the Government has said they are standing by this report.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM: Secondly, it is a commission report laid on the table, and not a member of the Government has said he is standing by it. I am pointing out that the practice of the Government every day shows that there are portions of this report that they do not believe in, because they are violating the findings of the report. I am not imputing motives at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member several times, with reference to statements made by the acting Minister of Railways and Canals, said he did not believe the statements he made.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, I did not say that—in the report.

Mr. SPEAKER: I listened to that several times, and I disliked very much to interrupt the hon. member in doing it; but in that statement he is distinctly out of order. If the hon. minister did not believe it and yet presented it to the House, he was doing something improper, something he should not do.

Mr. GRAHAM: Under that ruling any return a minister would present to the House he would fully believe in; and I would have no right to criticise the return. I am criticising a report and the minister has not said he believes in that report, and he may vote against it. Could he not vote against it?