

I therefore suggest to the Prime Minister the desirability of consulting with his officials in the Department of Justice and the Department of National Defence, and filing a plan to-morrow to acquire, not the timber, not the trees, not the forests, but the soil, the land of Anticosti island, making it clear that we do not want the trees. If they desire to carry on their operations they will still be able to do so, but we shall own the land itself in right of the crown. Then the question of taking possession comes up. We have the right to take possession at once when we deposit a plan. We deposit a plan indicating as nearly as we can the land which we are taking possession of—very simple in this case, for it is the land of Anticosti island. Sub-section 2 of section 9 provides:

When any land taken is required for a limited time only, or only a limited estate or interest therein is required, the plan and description so deposited may indicate, by appropriate words written or printed thereon that the land is taken for such limited time only, or that only such limited estate or interest therein is taken, and by the deposit in such case, the right of possession for such limited time, or such limited estate or interest shall become and be vested in his majesty.

I repeat that we would get out of a very difficult position by merely expropriating the soil, leaving the trees, making it clear that we are not taking the forests, and that those who are acquiring them, if they desire to do so for the purpose of operating the mills, cutting down pulpwood and doing matters of that kind, may be able to do so. Have it written on the plan that the widest possible facilities will be afforded by the crown to those who may desire to carry on lumbering operations.

Mr. POWER: I am informed that we have some title to the sites of the lighthouses, so that the federal government has at least a foothold. Besides that, the federal government at one time, over my very serious protest, subscribed something like three or four hundred thousand dollars to the harbour of Anticosti, so that we have some claim on the wharves.

Mr. BENNETT: I looked into the wharf situation, and I am bound to say that on a moment's reflection I should have remembered the lighthouses because I have passed by when the lights were shining and I realized that they were under federal power. I should have remembered that, and I thank the hon. gentleman for directing my attention to it. I do remember the harbour; it was assistance given to the enterprise that was undertaking to remove pulpwood from Anticosti, which

they said they could not ship because of lack of facilities for doing so. It was essential that they should have a harbour to enable barges to be laden with the wood and towed down to one of the pulp and paper mills. I do not think it can be said that the Anticosti venture has been a great success. I put it as mildly as that and say nothing further about it. But here is an opportunity for us to acquire what I describe as the title to the surface. On the plan we can make it clear that we do not want anything in the way of buildings that are owned by others, or trees, forests or anything else, but that the crown for national reasons proposes to acquire property in the soil. It can be made plain that any use that may be desired for purposes of development will always be facilitated, that any facilities required will be available, and that they will be free to put up a mill or do work of that sort. That has been done in this country.

I suppose it does no harm for one to refer to the fact that when we went to Churchill and chose that as our site we filed a plan. Although there had been a great deal of what might be called speculative buying and selling of that townsite, nevertheless people were awarded \$60 a lot by the exchequer court. That is my memory of it. At any rate, it was a very small sum. There may be some members in this house who recall the exact amount. It will be remembered also that when we had to do with the improvements in Montreal, without waiting even for all the details, a plan was filed in the name of the Minister of Railways and all that land was vested in the crown. The present Minister of Finance was then Minister of Railways. The hon. gentleman is now coming into the chamber, and I may tell him I am referring to the plan filed by the Minister of Railways at that time for the acquisition of lands in Montreal in connection with the proposed construction of the terminals there. I was also discussing what was done in connection with the filing of a plan for taking over the townsite at Churchill under the Expropriation Act. A question was raised in the court as to the validity of these actions and the court sustained the action taken by the government, holding that under this very statute it was a valid exercise of power in connection with the Churchill matter.

I suggest that the cost would be insignificant, trifling—why? Because we do not suggest for a moment that we are going to take that to which value has been attached. If all these stories are true, these people are not