

Mr. ROSS: I was paired with the senior member for Ottawa. Had I voted I would have voted against sustaining the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was paired with the hon. Minister of Railways. Had I voted I would have voted against sustaining the ruling of the Chair.

The ruling of the Chair confirmed.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: Has the hon. the Postmaster General voted?

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, an hon. member has the right to call your attention to the fact that another hon. member has not voted. If an hon. member is in the Chamber, he is bound to vote unless he is paired.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understand it, the hon. member did not call my attention to the fact that the Postmaster General had not voted, but he asked the question directly to the Postmaster General, and I took it to be in the discretion of the Postmaster General whether he should answer the question or not.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Postmaster General has not voted.

Mr. PELLETIER: My hon. friend's mind will be set at rest when I state that I never vote in this House on any question when the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) is not in his seat, but I do not think it is necessary to say so every time.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance) for Committee of Supply, resumed from March 24.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM: When the House adjourned last night, I had been dealing with several important 4 p.m. items in the report of the National Transcontinental Railway Investigating Commission. I think I dealt with all the large items included in the \$40,000,000. At the time of adjournment I was discussing that part of the report where Mr. Gutelius suggested that the money spent on the line east of Quebec should not have been so expended, but that a portion of it should have been expended in reducing the grades and curves on the Intercolonial railway, particularly,

because that railway lends itself to the introduction of gradients of 0.4 per cent against eastbound traffic and 0.6 per cent against westbound traffic.

Before I leave the question of grades, I want to ask the Government and the members of this House to look at the question of velocity grades from another angle. I stated yesterday what is an evident fact that there is a difference of opinion as to the practicability of velocity grades, particularly in a country like ours. The Maintenance of Way Association of America, composed of the chief engineers of the great railways and members of the engineering staffs, have intimated that the introduction of velocity grades in the construction of a new line ought to be practiced only under very extraordinary circumstances. There are authorities both pro and con, but I think that the most eminent authorities are against velocity grades in the construction of new lines and in a country where we have snow and frost to the extent that we have in this country.

For a moment I want to ask the House to view this matter, so far as the Transcontinental railway is concerned, from another standpoint. Granted that there is disagreement of opinion, there can be no dispute as to whether a four-tenths or a six-tenths grade is equal to a velocity grade. No engineer or operator will say that a velocity grade line is superior to a level line; many of the most eminent authorities do say that a velocity grade line is inferior to a level line. That being true, why should the Government, when the country is expending so many millions of dollars in this project, substitute a policy in respect of which there is grave disagreement for a policy on which there is absolute agreement, particularly when the line is nearly finished? Would any business man take such a course in his own business? At least there is no dispute as to the equality of the level line with the velocity grade line; there is a disagreement as to whether the velocity grade line is equal to the level line. Therefore I say it is poor judgment, it is not good business, to accept that policy upon which there is grave disagreement and to substitute for it a policy upon which there is no disagreement whatever.

I want for a moment to refer to the last clause of this report—and here, I think, we find a condensation of the views of the commissioners. I submit to this House and to the country that the statement and the criticism found in this clause is unwarranted, and, to put it mildly, a most egregious blunder so far as the Dominion of Can-