

We are not asking that now. It bears on the compensation to be paid.

Mr. VIEN: But we commit ourselves to come to that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly we do. I said that evidence would be produced to show what would be required. My hon. friend argued that we as members do not know anything about the condition of the road. He said that we could not tell simply by travelling over one line. "We all know," he said, "that the Toronto-Montreal road is good, and is one of the best equipped roads." If we all know that, cannot hon. members who travel over other lines know something about them? Surely we are as competent to judge of one line as another. We are not experts, but we know enough to know that there has been no substantial variation in upkeep from the condition in 1916, and that is sufficient for our purpose. We will go before the Board of Arbitration and endeavour to establish our contention that owing to insufficient upkeep there should be a smaller amount paid for the stock. That is the place to bring forward those details.

Mr. FOURNIER: What amount has been expended on the Grand Trunk for maintenance per mile in 1916, 1917 and 1918, as compared with the Canadian Pacific expenditure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If that information is not in this memoranda, it will certainly be given.

Mr. McMASTER: I should not like to allow something which the minister has said to give an inaccurate impression to the country. The report of the Royal Commission to inquire into the railways and transportation in Canada, commonly known as the Drayton-Acworth report, has been referred to in most commendatory terms by the Minister of the Interior. I think it is the treasure house of facts upon which a number of us are relying in our study of this question. I gathered from what the minister said that according to this report it would take \$21,000,000 to put the Grand Trunk in proper condition in 1916. That is not what the Drayton-Acworth report says, but a very much larger amount. On page xxxiv the commissioners state:

Putting together revenue and capital expenditure, we find that the Grand Trunk Railway, in the opinion of its own officers, requires over \$51,000,000 spent upon it to put it in a position to meet the requirements of its to-day's business.

[Mr. Meighen.]

I make that statement because I think that, quite unwittingly, some hon. members who have discussed this question may have given the impression to the House and the country that a very much smaller amount was required.

Mr. VIEN: What I mentioned, and what I think I said, was that \$21,000,000 which should have been used for the maintenance of the road and rolling stock was diverted for dividend purposes. That appears on page 99 of the report.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My own recollection is the same as to the figures, and that is the amount we really ought to be discussing at this point. It may take more money for the road's requirements, but that extra money will all be represented in value in the road; that is to say, a terminal may be needed here and something else there, but that is not due to depreciation, but simply to the development of the concern. The figure which the hon. member (Mr. Vien) quoted is the figure that ought to be used when we are arguing on what sum the Drayton-Acworth report finds should be spent in order to bring the road as it is now into a reasonable condition of upkeep. The Drayton-Acworth report says that that sum should have been used on the road in order to keep it up to a reasonable degree of maintenance, instead of being paid out in dividends. That is the amount in question in this connection.

My hon. friend (Mr. Fournier) will find the answer to his question on pages 48 and 49 of the memoranda. If he will look at the bottom of page 49 particularly, he will see that the maintenance of equipment figures are given as follows: 1918, \$14,434,684, as against only \$9,380,688 the year before, an increase of about 40 per cent; 1916, \$7,329,455; 1915, \$6,847,059.

Mr. FOURNIER: Will the minister complete the answer to my question by bringing down the railway statistics showing the Canadian Pacific Railway expenditures per mile?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. FOURNIER: The same expenditures as the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can give those figures for I remember seeing them myself.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I must persist in my previous question which the minister seems to treat lightly, that is, as regards the list of shareholders. The