

of Quebec. What have they done during the two years they have been in office? When we left office, in October, 1911, we had passed contracts to provide provisional terminals. We had a contract amounting to \$1,000,000 for a station at the Champlain market. We had contracts ready to be given and I think they had been awarded for the building of wharfs on the front of the St. Lawrence, something like 2,000 feet in length, which were to cost something like \$5,000,000. These works were absolutely necessary for the operation of the road. It is impossible to operate a railroad unless you have a station. It is impossible to connect the road with what we hope to have, an ocean service, unless you have wharfs also. What has been done about these wharfs? Not one foot of them has ever been undertaken up to the present time. What has been done at the station? Nothing at all, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) has cancelled that contract. He told us nearly two years ago, in the session of 1911-12, that he would not have the station at the Champlain market, that he was contemplating a union station elsewhere. He told us at the same time that he would have a small station at the Champlain market place. Has this small station been commenced? Not up to the present time. What has been done? The only thing done towards the provision of terminals has been the commencing of shops at St. Romuald. The late commission has laid out the shops at St. Foy; the ground had been purchased and prepared; but the new commission thought it advisable to change the site of the shops and to place them at St. Malo; that is, to transfer them from the valley of the St. Lawrence to the valley of the St. Charles. As to this I pass no judgment because we have not yet had information on this subject. But I know one thing: even if it be good policy, for engineering reasons, to have the site of those shops changed, you cannot use those shops, as has been stated by the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) himself, unless you have a tunnel from the valley of the St. Lawrence to the valley of the St. Charles. Has this work been commenced? It has not. When will it be commenced? It is impossible to say; we have no information. What time will be required for its construction? We do not know. Have the surveys been prepared? I am not aware that they have. No, nothing has been done up to the present time in order to complete the road and make it available. More than that,

I understand—and we shall have to ask the information from the Minister of Railways on this point—that an arrangement has been made to have a joint station between the Canadian Pacific railway and the Transcontinental railway. I would like to know if the Grand Trunk Pacific railway has been a party to such an agreement as that. I have reason to believe, and I think I can assert—and I challenge contradiction on this point—that these changes which I have just mentioned, the removal of the shops to St. Malo and the removal of the station from the Champlain market place, have been made without the approval of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, and, under the law passed by this Parliament in 1903, the Grand Trunk Pacific railway must be a party to any such changes as these. If the Grand Trunk Pacific railway had been a party to this arrangement, Parliament, I am sure, would have been made aware of that fact long ago; but up to the present time we have received no information that it is a party. If I am in error in this I would be glad to be informed, and I hope the information will be laid before us at the earliest possible moment; in fact, I may venture to say to the Minister of Railways that he is bound at the earliest moment to place before us not only the report of the Commission of Inquiry which has been investigating the work performed by the late Administration, but all information respecting all changes that have been made by the new Transcontinental Railway Commission upon the work of the late commission.

My hon. friend the mover of the Address referred to some things that were not referred to in the Speech. Yes, there are two things not referred to. One is the Highways Bill. I was surprised to hear my hon. friend the member for York, N.B., (Mr. McLeod) tell us that the measure which was introduced was a fair measure in every particular. I say to him—and we shall have to debate this more than once in this House—that the Highways Bill which was introduced was not only unfair but was in direct violation of the constitution of Canada. It has been stated more than once that the object of this Bill was to help the provinces. I do not deny it; we never denied it; we have always affirmed the principle of the Bill, but we condemned the manner in which it was proposed to help the provinces in this Bill which was in marked contrast to another Bill introduced by the Minister of Agriculture to help the provinces in the matter of agriculture. One was passed and became law. The other was passed with