

we do get it we give it as soon as it comes into our possession. We do not know any other way of dealing with the business of the House.

THE FRENCH TRANSLATION OF THE PAPERS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. T. C. CASGRAIN (Montmorency).—(Translation.)—Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the way in which the translation of our papers is done.

The PRIME MINISTER (The Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.) (Translation.) Is the hon. gentleman referring to the 'Hansard'?

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) No, I am alluding to the papers of the House. Last year I had the opportunity of bringing to the attention of the House that very same matter, and now I wish to give an instance which shows how faulty, to say the least, that translation is.

I have placed on the Order Paper of the day a question in connection with a ferry boat which is to accommodate Rivière Ouelle and the north shore of the St. Lawrence. Now, they have translated the word 'ferry' by the French word 'bac.' I would not have thought it was worth while to correct that error, were it not that I do not wish to be made a laughing stock to the community by leaving the public under the impression that I used the word 'bac' to describe the character of the accommodation which is to be given to the public by a ferry boat plying between Rivière Ouelle and La Malbaie. If you take the trouble of referring to Bescherelle's dictionary, you will find that 'bac' is described as follows: A large, flat boat, chiefly used for ferrying over a river, cattle, carts, &c., by means of a cable fastened on both shores.

The PRIME MINISTER. (Translation.) Where are the words to be found which you are complaining of?

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) At the top of page three of to-day's Order Paper. It would have been absolutely preposterous for me to have used such a word in describing the service which is to be provided by means of a ferry boat plying between Rivière Ouelle and the north shore of the St. Lawrence.

So, I think, the officials whose duty it is to translate the papers referred to, should give a closer attention to their work.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES ACT—PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend chapter 8 of the statutes of 1900, authorizing the granting of railway subsidies. He said: Chapter 8 of the statutes of 1900 makes a provision which I desire

slightly to amend. This provision is contained in section 3, subsection 'C' and is as follows:

Upon progress estimates and the certificate of the chief engineer of Railways and Canals, that in his opinion, having regard to the whole work undertaken and the aid granted, the progress made justifies the payment of a sum not less than \$60,000.

In practice, this provision is found to work to the detriment of roads whose subsidies are within the sum of \$60,000. A road with a larger subsidy, may upon a progress estimate apply for an allowance from the subsidy and upon the report of the chief engineer, that allowance can be made. But a road with a subsidy of \$60,000 or less, although it may be almost completed, although the progress estimates would show that a very small sum of money would be required to complete the road; yet a road of that character is absolutely debarred from an application for an allowance upon its subsidy under the progress estimate. It must be apparent to the House that this inadvertently works an injustice by putting a road with a small subsidy at a disadvantage as compared with roads having a larger subsidy. In view of this I have introduced this Bill which contains the simple provision that the figure '\$30,000' shall be substituted for '\$60,000.'

Mr. MONK. Is this amendment going to apply to railways which are only entitled to a subsidy of less than \$60,000, or has it a general application?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I might be permitted to explain that in 1898 we introduced a departure from the ordinary rule which governed the payment of subsidies, by providing that in respect to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and I think the Victoria bridge, which were likely to earn very large sums, and which would not be able to complete their line in ten-mile sections; that we should be authorized to make payment on progress estimates providing the amount earned on the said progress estimates would not be less than \$60,000. Not that the whole subsidy then earned would not exceed \$60,000, but when the amount to be earned with respect to such progress estimates would not exceed \$60,000.

Mr. MONK. Was that in 1900?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was before 1900. I think it was as early as 1898, because it was then that the Crow's Nest Pass contract was entered into. At the same time the Grand Trunk Railway was building the Victoria bridge.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Railways may remember that yesterday there was a debate on this very subject, in which I stated that the Railway Act was amended so that progress estimates might