

the hon. gentleman can give us all we can do is not to vote for the appropriation. The hon. gentleman cannot seriously ask us to vote for it when he has no reasons whatever to give us for it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have given reasons, but the hon. gentleman does not seem to accept them. The country is thoroughly well-known, and a couple of surveys were made—one I know, because I met the engineer personally when I was travelling around that section of the country. Judging from the fact that the company have already received a subsidy from the Local Government, they must have shown to the Local Government that they were in a position to build the railway; otherwise I suppose the money would not have been given to them. What we want to do is to ascertain whether this company are still in the position they occupied before, and if they cannot satisfy the Government of their ability to build the road, then it will be given to a company that will be acceptable to the Governor in Council.

Mr. LAURIER. That company will have no charter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friends on this side are certainly hard to please. My hon. friend the Postmaster General met an engineer who told him that the road was necessary and that the country was a very good one through which to build a road, and that ought to satisfy Parliament of the propriety of voting this large sum of money. I would like to know if that is all the information we are to receive. It does not seem that a railway company has been organized to build the road or that any organization has made an application for a subsidy; but the Government have so much money that they do not know what to do with it that they propose to advertise that we have some hundreds of thousands of dollars ready to appropriate in this way if somebody can be found who will take the money. That is about the proposition which the hon. gentlemen makes to us. One would suppose that before appropriations of this sort could be asked for from Parliament by the Crown, there would be carefully prepared surveys, estimates and statements showing the population of the particular district, the amount of trade likely to be secured, and all that information that any private company could find it necessary to possess before they would undertake to launch their money in such an enterprise.

To the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company for 240-100 miles of their railway from the end of the section subsidized by 53 Vic., chap. 2, at Huntingdon, towards the international boundary, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$7,680.

Mr. HAGGART. I wish to substitute for this the following:—

To the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company for 542-100 miles of their railway from Huntingdon towards the international boundary, which, with the distance between Valleyfield and Huntingdon 12 58-100 miles, makes up the distance of 18 miles named in 53 Victoria, chapter 2, and for 240-100 miles from the east end of the 18 miles referred to, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$25,024.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to ask the hon. Minister if he is quite certain that his figures with regard to this railway are correct now? A mistake was made last year in inserting the word Huntingdon. The number of miles were given correctly, but owing to the word Huntingdon being inserted the

Mr. LAURIER.

Auditor General refused to pay for more than 12 miles. I understand that the deficiency of 6 miles is provided for here.

Mr. HAGGART. The original grant was for 18 miles from Valleyfield to Huntingdon; but the distance is only 12 miles and the road I understand was built six miles beyond Huntingdon. The Auditor General refused to pay for the 18 miles, only paying for the 12 miles to Huntingdon. This vote is to cover the six miles and the  $2\frac{1}{10}$  miles.

Mr. LAURIER. There is a point of order in reference to this vote. It is proposed to increase the vote.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman takes the point of order I am afraid there will be nothing left for me but to give notice of the amended resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it should be done. I do not urge the point at all in a captious spirit, but the matter is one of importance, and I rather think it would be illegal if carried without notice.

To the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company, for 53 87-100 miles of their railway from Cornwall to Ottawa, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the 52 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, \$172,400.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a revote.

Mr. EDGAR. What is the prospect of getting the railway? Has anything been done towards its construction, even if the subsidy has not been earned?

Mr. HAGGART. There was nothing hard in regard to the construction, but a large amount of money has been expended in the shape of surveys, &c. From all I can learn, I believe that the company is in a position now, if it gets the subsidy, to go on and build the road.

To the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company, for 58 miles of their railway from a point at or near Cedar Creek to the town of Ridgeway, in lieu of the subsidies granted to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company (provincial charter) by the Acts 53 Vic., chap. 2, and 52 Vic., chap. 3, \$224,000.

Mr. ALLAN. In the proposed grant to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company, no provision is made for the Amherstburgh Branch as in the grant of 1889 of which this is a revote with that of the grant of 1890. I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Railways what his intentions are as to that part of the line.

Mr. HAGGART. There was an application, I believe, for the building of that branch, but we were limited in the amount of money for Ontario. I believe it is a very important branch, and I hope it will receive favourable consideration at another time from the Government.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I feel strongly, with the hon. member for South Essex, the desirability of aiding this portion of road from Harrow to Amherstburg, and I hope that in the coming session it will receive the consideration it merits.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I might add to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken my opinion that no grant given by Parliament would be of more service than the one just referred to.

To the Montfort Colonization Railway Company, for 25 miles of their railway from Lachute, St. Jérôme, or a point at or near St. Sévère, on the line of the Montreal and