

not be too many, because you cannot get the steel plate to build steel vessels unless you wait for three or four years, and that would be too long to wait if we want to increase the export of the goods of this country. One thing that is militating against the increase of the munitions industry in this country and causing the closing down of munitions work, is that tonnage is not available to export shells. I have in mind one yard where I saw piled up from eight to ten thousand tons of steel shells and ingots for use in Great Britain, piled up and rusting for the reason that there is no tonnage. The hon. member says private capital should build the ships. But every dollar of private capital that can be got to go into ships is in shipbuilding at the present time, and the only thing to do is for the Government to get what tonnage they can for Canada, and to carry on in the way they are doing. It seems absurd for this House or any member to claim that the Government is not doing its duty so far as shipbuilding is concerned. The shipbuilding industry in this country is more flourishing than the shell-making or any other industry, even farming, and for that reason the claim that the Government is not doing its duty towards that industry is absurd. I repeat that it is absolutely necessary for this country to see that in trade the East and West are joined together. The United States Government, when it built the Panama canal only two years ago, passed a law that no railroad company would be allowed to carry on the business of steamship transportation through the Panama canal. The American people claimed that a line of steamers through the canal should be controlled by the United States Government. Thus we are going along the lines suggested by the Americans. Many of those ships that are now being built—the thousand ships that the hon. member has mentioned—are for this very trade. Are we going to be behind the Americans? Is it not necessary for us to carry on our business in the same way as they are doing? I repeat that the Government are amply justified in this course, and if we are to have a great railway system such as we have, we must have its complement in the ships, and I think the time of this House has perhaps been well spent in showing up the absolute ignorance of hon. gentlemen opposite of the business of shipbuilding in this country.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the hon. member tell us what kind of boats the Minister of [Mr. Currie.]

Marine is building? It is news to us that the minister has a large number of ships under construction, and I feel interested. Are they steel or wooden ships?

Mr. CURRIE: I understand that the Minister of Marine will have his own estimates under consideration and then the House can get full information.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not see why the hon. member should not give us all the information we want on any subject whatever.

Mr. CURRIE: He is building both wood and iron ships, so far as I can ascertain.

Mr. SINCLAIR: But the hon. member told us a minute ago that we could not build any steel ships.

Mr. CURRIE: The contracts were let before the rush period. You cannot have your cake and eat it.

To provide amount required to be paid for the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway, the Quebec and Saguenay railway and the Lotbinière and Megantic railway, and for the equipment, appurtenances and properties used in connection with such railways, to be acquired under the authority of a statute passed at the last session; and to provide for the cost of completing, equipping and operating the said railways—the operating expenses to be chargeable to revenue—revote, \$3,667,745.07.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister explain how this amount of \$3,667,745.07 is arrived at? It puzzles me to know how the minister could get it down right to the 7 cents. The amount is to be determined by the judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. COCHRANE: Four million dollars was put in last year, and the difference between this amount and \$4,000,000 was spent last year on construction.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to know how the minister came to arrive at \$4,000,000. Under the statute, the amount to be paid was left to be settled by the Exchequer Court, and it was provided that the judge must be guided by the actual value based on the cost, deducting the amount of subsidies. In reading over the judgment of the judge of the Exchequer Court, I find that he leaves the amount very indefinite. In respect to one road, the Quebec and Montmorency, the claim being made that the value was some \$2,000,000, I find it stated that the representative of my hon. friend, who would be the counsel for the Crown, stated that he was perfectly willing that this two million odd dollars should