

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because when he tries to give out that there is a pledge in the bill, there is no pledge at all. From now to the end of the session, you can pass ten bills a day of this character, and that is not a pledge to anybody that a mile or a foot of road will be built. The minister is not going to spend a dollar in this district this year, as I understand the matter. Why is he before parliament this year? Is he afraid that the Canadian Pacific might get in and pre-empt this territory?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not speaking for the Canadian Pacific. Possibly my right hon. friend is. I am speaking for the Canadian National.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not insinuate that the minister was speaking for the Canadian Pacific, and I should like to know why he insinuates that I am.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend suggested that I was trying to keep the Canadian Pacific out of Guysborough.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is mentioned in the letter of Sir Henry Thornton. He says that one of the things that has governed them has been the consideration that we should take territory that might be taken by others. There is only one other person that might take it. This is a special case. The minister does not intend to spend any money at all this year, so one would naturally assume that that was the application. The minister knows there is no chance whatever of spending this money, so why is he before parliament this year with a request for authority which he does not propose to exercise, and that next year can be given just as well as now?

Mr. GRAHAM: For the same reason, possibly—I will not say the same reason because I do not know what his reason was—that my right hon. friend put through a highways bill, paying so much each year. The amount due the year following was not to be paid the first year at all, yet he put the amount in the bill for ten years in advance. He objects to a railway programme of three years, but he made a highway programme for ten years without one dollar of it ever going into the estimates, except for salaries of officers at Ottawa.

An hon. MEMBER: Five years.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps it was. My recollection was ten years. His reason was the same as ours in this. In order that the people might know that they were going to get

the highways, he spread the amount over a period of ten years, so that there would be no question. If he had had to have so much one year and so much the next, he would have put it in the estimates. The same thing applies to the appropriation for agricultural instruction. If his theory is good in this case, it would have been good for him to put in the estimates the amount intended for the year for agricultural instruction. But did he do that? No, he brought in a bill and not an item was put in the estimates in any year for that expenditure. Further than that, some years ago I had the honour of introducing a bill in this House for the removal of level crossings in Canada, railway construction in that sense. Parliament unanimously spread it over a term of years, voting a certain amount each year on which the Board of Railway Commissioners could draw for the government's share of eliminating level crossings. If my hon. friend's theory is right to-night, then I should have gone to the Railway Commission and said: How many crossings are you going to order eliminated this year and we will put in an estimate? Now, apparently that was not the proper thing to do. In 1919, my right hon. friend had that bill renewed for a term of years, and it is in the statute books to-day. The same is the case with subsidies granted to railways other than our own. Subsidies are spread over a term of years, the amounts to be paid to companies when their certificates of construction are received. Why should we not use our own line of railway as fairly as we have used other lines of railway, when we gave them subsidies? If my hon. friend wants to take the attitude of being opposed to the Canadian National, he has a perfect right to do so, but he has no right to do so under an assumed belief.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has got quite heated and delivered a rather rapid and eloquent oration. The only difficulty is that it is not correct. I have not had time to go through all the estimates, but I have managed to get to one even though he has travelled very fast. He stated that we passed an agricultural act without a word of placing anything in the estimates. We put through an act, but we put an amount in the estimates every year.

Mr. GRAHAM: Paid by statute. It was under the authority of the Agricultural Instruction Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, under the estimate. I have the 1923-24 estimate which reads: