shown not only a disposition, but it has laid before Parliament repeatedly a number of Propositions, to aid in the development of the great North-west, and I am not boasting when I say that few governments would have gone further. It is a very grave question whether we have gone too far, as intimated, and very properly so, by the hon member for Richmond, considering the finances of the country. That is a question that we may possibly discuss more intelligently when the papers are laid before the House. I will see that all the papers asked for contained in the motion are laid before the Senate at the earliest possible moment.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Before the rearrangement is carried out, I should like to ask whether it is to be made the subject of an Act of Parliament. There have been occasions when a resolution passed by the Privy Council has been approved by the other chamber and has sometimes been acted upon. What I desire to know is whether this rearrangement will be made the subject of legislation, and whether both Houses will be asked to pronounce upon it.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I was under the impression that I had made that statement. The arrangement is subject to the approval of Parliament, and occupies the same position as the Short Line proposition.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I should like to ask, is this subsidy conditional upon the road being constructed as a through road, or simply as a colonization road? Has any assurance, or financial guarantee been lodged with the government as to the ability of the Present company to complete the road?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The change in the contract, or the agreement with the company, relates only to the extension of the road as far as Saskatchewan. There have been no securities lodged, and we were not in a position to enter into any contract or any agreement with that company, until the approval of Parliament had been obtained.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Then it is only as a colonization road that the government is coming to the assistance of the company, I understand?

Hon. Mr. POWER—The hon. leader of the government spoke of the change in the manner of giving the subsidy to this company as a mere rearrangement, and he rather gave the House to understand that there was not any reason why the hon. gentleman from Richmond, or any other hon, gentleman, should be at all disturbed; that we were not increasing our liabilities. but simply rearranging them, putting them in better form. That reminds me of the old story told in 1878 when the people down in the lower provinces were a little nervous, having heard talk increasing the tariff, and when Sir Leonard Tilley telegraphed to Sir John Macdonald at Ottawa to know if it was intended to increase the tariff, that astute gentleman telegraphed back that he did not mean to increase the tariff, but only to readjust it. This is a case of readjustment something like that.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon.gentleman has scarcely quoted my words as I uttered them. However, as it enables him to draw a deduction, I do not object to it.

Hon. Mr. POWER-I do not wish to attribute to the hon. gentleman language which he did not use. While the premier's language may be in a certain sense correct, it does not tell the whole story. As the legislation stands to-day, before Canada could be called upon to pay a dollar, the road has to be built and operation. Then the company are entitled to get a land grant, and a subsidy of \$80,000 If the people who took hold of the undertaking were substantial capitalists. that ought to be a satisfactory proposal to them, but the new proposition does not bind the company to do anything. They \$10,000 a mile for the road as it is constructed, and they may drop-

Hon. Sir MACKENIE BOWELL—That only shows the inconvenience of discussing in detail a question which is not properly before the House. The hon. gentleman says they are not bound to do anything; they are. The Order in Council lays down what they are to do.

Hon. Mr. POWER—We have had a good many other companies in the North-west