

posal, we can use the powers of the corporation, the organization which it has built up and the machinery at its disposal, and we could not have done that if we had pursued in every respect the method embodied in the legislation of 1914. Therefore, when my hon. friend, with something of a flourish at the commencement of his speech, said that he had a method that would avoid any inquiry, any arbitration, and any delay, he was speaking without his book, unless he is prepared to say that he will support legislation which will deny to any man or any group of men in this country the right to come forward and support by evidence, if they can, the reasonable value of property taken from them. I do not think it would be in the interest of this country, which for many years to come must be a great borrowing country, if its resources are to be developed, that the Parliament of Canada should adopt any such method as that. It would be exceedingly unfortunate that it should go abroad, to the United States of America, to Great Britain, or to any of the other great lending countries of the world, that the people of Canada are represented in Parliament by men who are disposed, on occasion, for one purpose or another, to deny to those whose property is taken against their will, the right and the opportunity to make good their claim as to its value before an impartial and properly constituted tribunal."

INCONSISTENCY OF THE OPPOSITION.

After having as completely answered Opposition objections to the Government's proposals, the Prime Minister went on to sharply expose the inconsistency of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's followers in opposing in 1917 that which, under similar circumstances, they strongly advocated in 1914. Said the Premier:

"What was the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite who put forward views on this question in 1914? All the leading men among them who spoke said that the Canadian North-