

same with some slight modifications. The principle behind both was the same. To avoid misunderstanding I shall read the resolution as moved last year. As reported at page 424 of Hansard of March 10, 1930, Mr. Kellner moved:

Whereas the need for establishment of high-ways is greater than in 1919;

And whereas in that year the dominion government recognized its responsibility in this matter by a substantial grant, which grant is now exhausted;

Therefore be it resolved, that, in the opinion of this house, the government should consider the advisability that a further substantial grant be made to cover the next five years' development of highway construction.

That resolution was discussed very fully last year; a similar resolution was discussed very fully in 1929, and while in it he did not distinctly say that he advocated the construction of a trans-Canada highway, that was the basis of every speech that was delivered, including that of the hon. member who moved the resolution. I spoke upon the resolution last year, and I also spoke upon the one of the previous year. Every member who spoke upon it—although I have not read the speeches recently, I remember the discussion quite clearly—took the attitude that the purpose of the resolution was to a large extent the building of a trans-Canada highway. This was not contradicted by anybody at that time. Rather strangely, both last year and the year before, that resolution moved by Mr. Kellner, which in principle advocated the building of a trans-Canada highway by assistance given to the provinces by the dominion government, was voted down by a solid Liberal vote. If one cares to look up the vote in 1930—I have not looked up the 1929 vote—he will find that both the hon. member for North Timiskaming and the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River were among those who voted against that resolution. I am not saying this in any spirit of recrimination, or with any special desire to embarrass them, but I believe these facts should be made known to the house.

Mr. BRADETTE: The hon. member is not a lawyer, but he is a good doctor. Can he find in that resolution any mention of a trans-Canada highway? I should like the hon. member to read some of the observations of the mover of the resolution.

Mr. MANION: I have not time to do so. The hon. gentleman spoke for the better part of an hour or longer and he had plenty of time to read them himself.

Mr. BRADETTE: The hon. member should be fair. He should read the remarks of the mover.

Mr. MANION: I make the statement that the then hon. member for Athabaska and practically everybody else who spoke on the subject, took the attitude that the resolution referred to the building of a trans-Canada highway. I shall not attempt to read sentences from the speech of the then hon. member for Athabaska on that subject, but I intend to read some of the statements made by certain leading members of my hon. friend's party which was then in power. It is true that neither my hon. friend from North Timiskaming nor my hon. friend from Kenora-Rainy River spoke on the question, although they voted against the resolution. I wish now to quote from the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Dunning, the then Minister of Finance:

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is the obligation of hon. members of this house when they bring forward resolutions of this kind, imposing as they would, if implemented, a load upon the dominion treasury, to tell the house the amount of financial obligation involved in carrying into effect the terms of the resolution proposed.

A little later on I find the following:

I cannot vote for this resolution, first, because of what I have previously stated; second, because the movers of it and those speaking in support of it do not indicate what the financial load shall be upon the dominion, nor do they indicate in the resolution any principle upon which division should be made between the provinces which are to be served by it; and, finally, because I believe this dominion has at the present time, in connection with water transportation and air transportation with its tremendous responsibility with respect to railway transportation, with the need that exists for progressively reducing her public debt and reducing taxation, plenty to take care of without going, by grace, into the field of provincial responsibility and handing out money to another authority for a purpose which is really their own.

I have read the statement of Hon. Mr. Dunning, the then Minister of Finance. I shall now direct the attention of hon. members to the remarks of the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), because he was one of the few private members of the house who spoke on the question. This leader of the Liberal party spoke as follows:

It is rather dangerous to deal with such a delicate matter as this. I believe there is in the constitution nothing that empowers the federal parliament to approve such a resolution. Moreover, if parliament votes in favour of such a resolution, many provinces may complain that the federal government is infringing on provincial rights.

There is the old story of the British North America Act. Let me now quote one or two sentences from the speech of my right hon. friend the then leader of the government, at