

in regard to this proposed grading of subsidies, about this \$3,200 per mile—what the government include in the cost of construction?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—In the past, in special cases where the country was known to be very difficult to build a road in, subsidies to the amount of \$6,400 have been given, and it was thought that it would be fairer to grade the amount where it was over \$15,000 per mile. Perhaps in one case the road might cost \$20,000 per mile and another \$25,000, and in those cases they would receive the same subsidy of \$6,400. It was considered the experiment should be tried to grade them. Attention was called to the fact in the House of Commons that where a road was built into a town or city it might enable a road, which otherwise might not be entitled to \$6,400, to obtain that subsidy, and so an amendment was made, in this bill, that it should not include the cost of equipping the railway, nor the cost of terminals of the railway in any city or incorporated town; so that it would only apply on the ordinary line, and not be due to causes which would of course increase the cost of all railways—that is the entry into towns. The practice has been to give to bridges fifteen per cent of the cost. There is no statute on the subject, but it has been a settled practice that railway bridges, as a rule, receive that subsidy. I do not know of any case where it was refused. It is here provided that where the bridge forms part of the railway line, and the cost of the bridge does not exceed \$25,000, it counts in as part of the line. Where the cost is greater than that, it is entitled to the usual bonus of fifteen per cent on the cost.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—Do I understand that these clauses are added in the bill?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—These amendments are made in the bill.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—We have not seen them here.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, they were made in the House of Commons this morning.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—Those amendments do certainly remove what appeared to me to be the chief objection to that feature of the bill. There is only one other question which I would like to ask the hon.

gentleman, and that is with regard to town and municipal grants. Do the government deduct them in estimating—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Oh no, they have never been deducted in the past.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Has that bill been circulated?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, it has only been printed. This bill and the Supply Bill have never been printed as a rule.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. POWER—These subsidies are set out in the minutes of the House of Commons. The resolutions are set out in the minutes of the House of Commons.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—There is another very important point to which the hon. gentleman has not called attention.

Hon. Mr. POWER—They were only made in the House of Commons this morning.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I understand that. I was going to point out that though they may be in the minutes of the House of Commons, we do not see the amendments and consequently cannot speak intelligently upon them. If the hon. gentleman who has just spoken had seen the amendment, he would have been saved the trouble of asking the question.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I must apologize of course. The practice has been an objectionable one, and I shall do my best to have it changed. If you look over the journals you will see that in former sessions the House of Commons has sent down a number of bills on the last day when it was impossible for us to give them proper consideration. We have often protested, and I think we will insist another year that this shall not be allowed to continue. It is not justifiable. I can only throw myself on the kindness of the House on the present occasion and apologize for what I think is an improper treatment of this House.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—We are not in a position to consider those bills intelligently without having them before us a little earlier, and having some time to give thought