

Arthur and Fort Francis and Quebec, shall be commenced within five years and built within ten years, the lines mentioned in subsections B, C and D shall be commenced within two years and completed within five years; the lines mentioned in subsections E and F shall be commenced within three years and completed within six years. That seems to me definite enough.

Mr. McCREARY. It does not limit them to build any portion in any one year.

Mr. SPROULE. The lines on each of these sections shall be commenced and finished within a limited time, which is moderately short. Now with reference to the objection which the hon. member has taken to that branch leading down to the Red Deer district, it seems to me, after looking at the map, as we did when we were discussing it, that it came so near to the Canadian Pacific Railway that in all probability that short length will be finished, and there will be the most direct route for immigrants into that country.

Mr. McCREARY. Why don't they go down to the line?

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt, when they are building that line, if they find, as they will find, that it will be a matter of importance and convenience to the people to have it, they will get powers to go on and connect the two. If the one line is built so close to the other, as it seems to be, provided the map gives a correct idea, there will be a connection made in a short time, a much shorter time than it would take to incorporate a company to build another line.

Mr. McCREARY. It is only a very short branch line; why don't they apply for the whole thing?

Mr. SPROULE. I rose at the time in committee to say that it would be the part of wisdom to extend that down to the other, but the hurry and bustle were so great that I could not be heard. Now with regard to the power which enables them to bond the road, including the incumbrances that are on it, of \$20,000 a mile; at first sight it seems to be unreasonable. But we give power to nearly all these roads through that country, especially where they have to go through a country like that between Port Arthur and Quebec, to bond \$20,000 and even \$30,000 a mile.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. gentleman is an old parliamentarian, and I am not. Will he tell me if this \$20,000 a mile will be an addition to the powers granted them last session under the Manitoba railway deal?

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that the powers which they will have under this Bill will only give them the right to bond, including the incumbrance already on it, to the extent of \$20,000 a mile. I may be wrong,

Mr. SPROULE.

but that is my interpretation of it. As to the powers which they have between Port Arthur and Quebec to build roads to Ottawa and Montreal, there is no starting point given, but there is a finishing point, namely, Montreal in the one case and Ottawa in the other. I objected to that, because I thought it was scarcely definite enough, but as it related to the indefinite future when they might require to build those lines, it would not be a serious objection. Beyond that the Bill seems to be much the same, containing much the same powers, as many other Bills we have passed. I admit it is a very long line, and the charter was somewhat of a blanket character. But after all, it contains very much the same rights and powers as we have given to many other companies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) made a reference to me. I think I ought to say that I have not had this Bill under consideration at all. It is true I am a member of the Railway Committee, but I was otherwise engaged, so I am not in a position to say anything. I regret that the Minister of Railways and Canals is not here, but on the point raised by my hon. friend I would not care to offer an opinion.

Mr. CLARKE. In view of the strong statements made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) respecting the character of this charter, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Railways and Canals is absent, would it not be well to postpone the further consideration of this Bill until the next opportunity of taking up private Bills? I am a member of the Railway Committee, but unfortunately I was not there when the Bill was being considered, and I have no idea as to the location or the distances which are covered by this charter. A strong point has been made by the hon. member for Selkirk as to the possible liability that may be imposed upon the province of Manitoba. In view of these statements, unless the government have made up their minds that the Bill is proper, I think it should not be proceeded with at this sitting. We should have an opportunity of ascertaining from the Minister of Railways and Canals whether he has examined all these allegations that have been made by the member for Selkirk.

Mr. McCREARY. The question of bonding the road was never touched upon in the Railway Committee.

Mr. CLARKE. That is an important point. Perhaps some other members of the cabinet who are present will give us further light. I was rather surprised at the statements made by the member for Selkirk.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the government had any objection to the Bill, of course it would have been stated by the Minister of Railways. There