

more, at present. I know that at this time the position taken by the Minister of Justice cannot be impeached. But we are entitled to have more information to enable us to reach definite conclusions on this question.

Mr. DOHERTY: Just in case I did not say it in words, let me state now that, of course, the papers will be brought down, and I should be glad to give any information on the subject that I can.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is one point which, perhaps, I did not make clear enough, and which I think the hon. minister should elucidate in the papers to be brought down, and that is why when Sir Allen Aylesworth filed an information for the small area of that property, immediately after his resignation the whole property was claimed for expropriation purposes by the Government. What was the correspondence, what was the influence which was brought to bear on the Government in favour of acquiring such increased area of that property? As is customary with him, my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) has been very courteous in this matter, and I do not doubt that he will bring the papers down as soon as possible. I can only say that there is a strange anomaly somewhere in this case. Notwithstanding the increased value which the late Government brought to land in and around Quebec by its progressive policy, there is certainly a strange anomaly in the fact that property which was bought for \$1,000 years ago, has been valued at from \$72,000 to \$73,000. The hon. gentleman knows the city of Quebec and its suburbs; he knows Sillery where the property is situated. I know those localities also, and nobody will make me believe that the value of that property has increased to such an extent as would be indicated by these figures. Be that as it may, I can only express regret that the Minister of Justice did not himself direct the proceedings in the case. He informs the House and the country that the appeal was withdrawn without his knowledge, as I understand him to say. Although the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General are not expected to follow closely every case from one end of the Dominion to the other, my hon. friend will understand that in a case of this nature when several other cases of expropriation must follow—

Mr. DOHERTY: My hon. friend will allow me. He understands that this is entirely the business of the Transcontinental Commission and not of the Government

directly. They retain their own counsel and direct their own cases, and this is not directly the case of the Government. It is impossible for the Government to know every step in each case.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Of course, I have every confidence that my hon. friend has a splendid grasp of his department—no one better fitted than he to be Minister of Justice. But I must express my surprise at the statement made just now by the hon. minister. He says that these expropriation cases are looked after by the Transcontinental Commission, that the commission has its own counsel and that these cases are followed by that counsel. Well, I have a copy of the case here for the Supreme Court of Canada. I have the factum of the appellant, His Majesty the King, and I see affixed to it the name of J. E. Chapleau, solicitor for the appellant. Now, the appellant is represented by the Attorney General of Canada. The proceedings, it appears, were started by Sir Allen Bristol Aylesworth, His Majesty's Attorney General for the Dominion of Canada on behalf of His Majesty.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is fair to assume that the hon. gentleman knows that the case had to be entered in the name of the Attorney General.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend will pardon me, he cannot shift the responsibility of his department to the Railway Commission. This is a case before the courts, and the hon. gentleman is responsible before Parliament and before the country for the administration of justice, and as Attorney General for every case which is pending before the courts as between His Majesty the King and any one of His Majesty's subjects.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no wish to shirk any responsibility. But whatever that responsibility, the fact is, and I think the hon. gentleman knows it, that the affairs of the Transcontinental railway are by law placed in the hands of a commission, and they cannot institute an action in the name of His Majesty otherwise than in the name of the Attorney General for Canada. But, of course, they do not refer every step in every case to the Minister of Justice—this step any more than another.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I still express my confidence in my hon. friend's judgment, but, at the same time, I must express regret that he takes the position he does. No doubt,