

Mr. GRAHAM: But you did not read the note at the bottom.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not note the footnote at the bottom, "authorized by statute" which would be an indication that it was not voted. But I want to draw to the attention of my hon. friend that while these amounts were not voted each year, except last year when the amount was voted, what I had before me indicated that all were voted, and I said so. While they were not voted, they appear in the estimates as stated by my hon. friend, and they appear as well at the bottom of the Agriculture estimates, so the House had before it in voting the money for Agriculture the exact amount that was passing by statute to the provinces; and there is this very great difference, the House debated it every year as well. I want to know, is the Minister of Railways going this year to bring down in the Supplementary Estimates—he could not be expected to in the Main Estimates because the bills will not be through—the amount expected to be expended this year? Will it appear there as was always the case under the Agricultural Instruction Act? I venture to say he will not and I want to draw his attention to this very marked difference: In respect of the Highways Act and the Agricultural Instruction Act the money was spent under the direct supervision of other governments responsible to other parliaments; in this case there is nothing of the kind. There is no supervision by this House at all or by any other House in Canada, once this bill passes the people have absolutely no further control. The minister asks the House now to vote the money for a period of years. In a case of that sort parliament every year ought to control and every year ought to vote the money. And under the old government in every such case parliament did. Never under the old government was there a dollar voted for the National Railways—although the money is now spent by a corporation and having been placed in their hands is no longer subject to our review—never was a dollar voted for those railways by guarantee, or by a straight loan, or by a grant, or anything else, which was not voted annually in the estimates. And this government has no excuse at all in this case for departing from that precedent. All this is done by a government that was going to restore the control of parliament that had been filched away, so it claimed, by the late administration. It is the old story "Those who talk the loudest mean the least." Those who talk the loudest, now destroy that which they so loudly professed.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. GRAHAM: The apology is accepted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps my hon. friend will give us some information as to how he proposes to finance this line, whether he proposes to bring votes down in the regular way and keep a thorough control of these funds?

Mr. GRAHAM: Will my hon. friend pardon me, I did not catch his question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was asking the minister, through the Chairman, how it was proposed to finance this line. I notice the work is not going to be done in one year, it is being extended over a series of years. So we shall have history repeating itself, and the real work will not be commenced until an election is due. Now, if this work is not to be done in one year, is parliament to have the usual control, is the appropriation for this work going to be included in the usual vote for all these lines?

Mr. GRAHAM: The same thing will be done as in the case of other votes by statute: There will be a full explanation given every year as to the amount of money to be expended during that year, and the amount of money expended the year previous. So that parliament will have absolute control to discuss the outlay from one end of the expenditure to the other.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask the minister what he means by "control to discuss"?

Mr. GRAHAM: Mostly what I said.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, Mr. Chairman, I also want to ask my hon. friend if it is not possible to provide us with maps which we can read without difficulty. The maps supplied to us are very small; I confess I cannot read anything on the map I have. It is therefore quite impossible to properly ascertain the position of these lines. Is it not possible when we are dealing with sums running into the millions of dollars to know what we are doing? No one can tell what we are doing from this small map. The other day when these discussions started I asked for a map and I think a good map should be provided without delay. I am now going to ask my hon. friend, does he himself know at what distance from the shore this line will be constructed for the major part of its length? Nobody here knows. Then does he know, for example, the distance there will be between this line and the existing railway to the north? Can he tell us that?