

that not a word was said about it heretofore?

The other gentlemen who are concerned in this plan which I submitted to the House are citizens of the United States, Messrs. Richardson, Stevens—

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) I would call the hon. member's attention to the fact that he is not allowed to discuss a measure which is not before the House.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I am not discussing the Bill; but I am going over the reasons which induced the hon. member for Two Mountains to vote against the Bill of which I was the promoter before this House. The hon. member stated that he had voted against the Bill because those interested in it were shameless speculators.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) I took it that the hon. member for Two Mountains was content with laying down the general principle, in stating that he was in favour of the building of a railway in that part of the country, provided the undertaking was in the hands of a bona fide company, and that he did not refer to the Bill which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is discussing. I must call the hon. member's attention to the fact that he has no right to discuss a Bill which has already been under discussion. I am confident that it will suffice for me to call his attention to the matter, and that he will readily comply with the rules of the House.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) But after my hon. friend from Two Mountains has stated that he was not in favour of a company made up of shameless speculators, it seems I might well be allowed to vindicate the perfect respectability of the promoters of the scheme. It is not my intention to discuss the merits of the Bill which I had the honour to submit to the House; but I wish to show that I was not acting for and in the name of shameless speculators, for these are the words which my hon. friend used just now.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) I must state the rule which forbids to re-open a former discussion. When a matter previously disposed of by the House is taken up once more, it seems clear to me that the rule is being disregarded. I state the rule, and I hope the hon. member will kindly conform to it.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I willingly comply with your request, Mr. Speaker. In answer to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Two Mountains, is it allowable, I say, to brand as shameless speculators men such as the hon. senator R. Thibaudeau, or Mr. Raphael, a reliable and thoroughly respectable business man of Montreal, and besides, an enthusiastic supporter of the Liberal party? Mr. McLaren, manufacturer, is also one of the shareholders; and

Mr. MONK.

I am exceedingly surprised, as, no doubt, will be all the citizens of Montreal, when they learn of it, to hear my hon. friend from Two Mountains call this business man a shameless speculator.

My hon. friend may complain of what he terms the unfairness of the papers which have taunted him for his stand in the matter, but he will have difficulty in explaining his conduct in connection with a Bill intended to benefit the county he represents; especially when it is taken into account that the company which these gentlemen had formed undertook to begin the work within a year and to finish it within three. Moreover, that company promised to comply with the requirements of the House regarding the amount of work to be carried out in the short space of a year.

I have given the names of the shareholders. I have shown that they are well known gentlemen. They are the only holders of shares, and my hon. friend has the proof of that. Under the circumstances, I fail to understand how my hon. friend has reached the conclusion that Mr. Armstrong alone was at the bottom of this scheme.

For it is for that reason, among others, that he refused to give his approval to that measure so important for his county. Today my hon. friend chatters about a man who was not a party to the Bill. My hon. friend has not given any proof of it; he has not been able, in any way, to detract in any way from the value of the authentic certificate signed by the company's secretary-treasurer.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) The certificate referred to has, I understand, been contradicted by a sworn statement of the hon. senator Thibaudeau, contained in the report of the Railway Department.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) As regards the matter of this certificate, I must say that I fail to see how it can be properly taken up at present in this House. That matter has previously been discussed before the committee.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I shall not discuss any longer, Mr. Speaker, the question of the certificate or its value in connection with the list of shareholders.

Now, my hon. friend appears to be very anxious that a line of railway be provided for his county. He states it is time that the government should grant subsidies for the building of a railway through his county; it is time, he says, we should obtain from the Treasury a grant to build such a railway. How can he reconcile that proposition with his refusal to grant delay to a company which did not ask for any charter or grant from this House, but merely requested the power to extend its line already in existence, and which would have run through his county as well as through those of Argenteuil, Laval and Jacques Cartier?