

is too late. And I would tell my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) that the population of St. Eustache and of St. Martin, in the county of Laval, are both served now by a railway. They are places of importance, no doubt, but they have a railway and they are in communication with Montreal. St. Martin is on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. St. Placide has no railway facilities. The three parishes I have named—Ste. Dorothee, in Laval; Isle Bizard and Ste. Genevieve, in the county of Jacques Cartier—are populous parishes which offer a magnificent opening for suburban passenger traffic; and, if it is not too late, as I do not think it is, I think the committee would do very well to add these three parishes.

Amendment negatived, and item agreed to.

To the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway for a line of railway from Aylmer to a point of junction with the Interprovincial Bridge approach in the city of Hull (except that portion thereof beginning at a point of junction with the line of the Hull Electric Railway in the city of Hull and terminating at a point on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at the east end of its Hull station yard) not exceeding nine miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 12 of section 2 of chapter 7, of 1899, and by the first portion of item 13 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to clear up a condition of things that has been existing in the department for a year or more. In 1897 there was voted to the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company (now the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway Company) a subsidy for 7½ miles of railway from Hull to Aylmer. Subsequently, in 1899, in consequence of the intended extension of the railway to the Interprovincial bridge approach, there was granted to this company, in lieu of the subsidy granted in 1897, a subsidy for a railway from Aylmer to Hull not exceeding nine miles. It appears that after the completion of the railway in 1901 the company applied for payment of the subsidy so granted, but on account of the wording of the Act, 'For a railway from Aylmer to Hull,' a single subsidy was paid in 1903 on the mileage from Aylmer to the junction in Hull with the Hull Electric Railway, a distance of 6.78 miles, and no subsidy was paid on the piece of line, .84 mile in length, from the company's junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway east of Hull station to the west approach of the Interprovincial bridge. In 1903, with a view of paying the subsidy on the said .84 mile, a provision was inserted in the Subsidy Act of that year, chapter 57, section 13, for a subsidy to the company for that portion of its line from a point at the east end of the Hull station yard of the Canadian Pacific Railway to a point of junction with the west approach of the Interprovincial bridge, not exceed-

M. MONK.

ing one mile. As the company was unable to show the cost of the said .84 mile, no subsidy has been paid on this portion of the line. The application of the company for a further subsidy reads as follows:

To the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway for those portions of its line extending from a point in the town of Aylmer into and through the city of Hull to the junction of the Interprovincial Bridge approach, to be considered for the purposes of this Act as one continuous line, a distance of 8.62 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by clause 12 of chapter 7 of 1899 and by that portion of clause 13 of chapter 57, 1903, referring to this railway.

Therefore this was actually earned. The interpretation put upon the words 'from Aylmer to Hull' constrained the Chief Engineer of Railways to stop the subsidy at the boundary line of Hull. Subsequently, this parliament sought to correct that by voting a subsidy for the distance from the Hull boundary to the Interprovincial bridge, which the company had constructed; but in attempting to work it out, when we sent the accountant into the department to audit the accounts the company were not able to discriminate as between the expenditures outside of Hull and the expenditures from the Hull boundary to the Interprovincial bridge. Therefore, as a matter of justice and equity, it seems to me that the balance due should now be paid.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount you have given them?

Mr. EMMERSON. The amount involved in this vote is \$2,688; that is, for .84 mile at \$3,200 a mile.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company own this road now?

Mr. EMMERSON. The subsidy was voted to the other company. This is not a claim of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what I want to know, whether you give it to the railway company, which seven or eight years ago sold the road and is now out of existence, or to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who are at present operating it?

Mr. EMMERSON. The subsidy goes to the old company. It was earned when that company was in operation and would have been paid but for the technical objections that were raised in the minds of those who were responsible for the administration of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. All I can say is that the principal owner of the road was Mr. Chapleau, and if he did not look after the interests of the road and see that it got every cent of money it earned, it is extraordinary to me.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Now that we have dealt with the main money subsidies, I