

parishes. But I have no objection if my hon. friend wishes that, to add it. I do not know that I have interfered with the part of the railway that goes through the county of my hon. friend and I do not think he has met my statement to the committee that this railway will serve by passing through the parishes I have named, a population entitled to the service. They are populous parishes not on a railway and under the contract in this form the railway might avoid them altogether. Again my hon. friend in opposing this motion, has stated that the plans of the company are deposited. That may be but I do not think they are approved by the department.

Mr. ETHIER. They were approved last year.

Mr. MONK. At any rate I do not think they are in that definite form that there would be any serious objection to indicating the route as proposed by this motion.

Mr. ETHER. My hon. friend knows that St. Bizzard is away from the line several miles.

Mr. MONK. Not the island at the foot of the parish.

Mr. ETHIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) was a director of this company at the time the plans were laid and deposited, from the junction to St. Andrews and they have been deposited for about a year.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will have to oppose this amendment for the reason that a contract has been entered into with this company based upon the original vote, with the description as contained in the Subsidy Act of 1903, which we were now revoting. Under these circumstances my hon. friend will appreciate the fact that it would be a very embarrassing and even perhaps dangerous thing to amend the description. The map was approved and the government has in fact a detailed map which has been considered by the Railway Commission. If my hon. friend presses his amendment I will have to ask to have it negated.

Mr. MONK. When was this plan approved of by the government?

Mr. EMMERSON. I had the parties before me, I am pretty certain.

Mr. MONK. Had the details of the road been adopted by the Board of Railway Commissioners?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, I understood they had gone before the commission but I do not know personally.

Mr. MONK. I do not think so. I was in the very beginning, one of the directors of the company referred to, because that was a condition imposed by the government at the time the railway was originally incorporated under the name of the Ottawa River Railway Company. But the plans are not so

far advanced, the position as to those plans is not of such a nature at the present moment, or I am greatly mistaken, that we cannot still include these parishes. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that it is a revote. I admit that and that the terms of the revote are the terms of the statute of 1904, but in a revote it is surely within our jurisdiction to make such a small and unimportant modification as this.

Mr. EMMERSON. If a contract has been entered into?

Mr. MONK. A contract in which the government is concerned?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, a subsidy contract, between the company and the government. The law clerk reminds me that such a contract was entered into.

Mr. MONK. I do not want to contradict the minister on that point, but I do not think there has been any contract as to the subsidy finally entered into between the government and the Central Canada Railway Company. It would be possibly an objection, at least it would be an objection on the part of my hon. friend but it is no reason why I should not urge here, representing the county, that the grant should be made in that form.

Mr. GERMAN. Financial arrangements are being made in London and are practically completed for the construction of this railroad with English capital, based on the supposition that the subsidy voted in 1904 would not be revoked at this session of parliament. Those arrangements having been completed, the prospectus having been issued on the basis of the revote of this subsidy, it would rather demoralize things on the London market if now any change was made in this subsidy by the apparent construction of a different line from that which is indicated in the subsidy proposed to be voted. It might not be a particularly serious thing to those who actually know the conditions, but to people 3,000 miles away, who do not know, a change from the line originally intended would look like bad faith on the part of the people financing this enterprise, so I must earnestly ask the Minister of Railways and Canals and this committee not to consent to any change in the subsidy as at present.

Mr. EMMERSON. I made the statement that a subsidy contract had been entered into. I am not certain as to what I made the statement upon the suggestion of the law clerk. I do not remember signing any such contract but it may be in existence. However we will discuss it from the standpoint of there being no contract.

Mr. MONK. Of course, I would not like to do anything which would interfere with the construction of the railway and the financial arrangements to which my hon. friend has alluded, but I do not think it