

much importance. The expenditure with regard to which progress estimates are required must be less than \$60,000, and he seeks to lower the minimum \$30,000. Surely, if the undertaking is of any importance whatever, the company are in a position to finish it; and when they finish it, they can get the full amount of subsidy they are entitled to. What I protest against is the advancing of money on progress estimates on a work where there is a possibility—not a probability only but even a possibility—of the road not being completed and used. Surveys, obtaining of the land, clearing it, putting it in shape to build the road—there may be advances on all these under the clause of the Railway Act, yet the road may never actually be built; and in that case the country simply loses the money paid in advance on the progress estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is another consideration to which, perhaps, the Minister of Railways and Canals will attach some importance. It has been stated in the House that subsidies for certain railways which are not now in operation were diverted in some way from the purpose for which they were intended. I have no knowledge of it myself, but if it is the case, as has been stated, does it not make it the duty of the government to announce a policy which will make more stringent the conditions touching the payment of these subsidies, rather than relax them? I do not know how many of the roads would come within the operation of this Bill, nor have I any idea as to the roads referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). But certainly the statements which have been made in this House with regard to this matter within the past few days should make us move in the direction of tightening the purse strings in the payment of these subsidies, rather than in the direction of a more lax system.

Mr. MONK. I would move that the Committee recommend that this Bill be referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would call the attention of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to the fact that his motion is not in order. This motion is one to be made in the House, not in committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion is out of order.

Mr. MONK. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that I should offer any objection to this motion, nor shall I offer any. But I think that before we are through with the matter the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) will, perhaps, be ready to admit that he has been rather captious and unreasonable with regard to it. However, let that go.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is not for the purpose of killing the Bill, but to make the motion in the House that the Bill be referred to the Railway Committee where it can be more fully considered.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

CATTLE-GUARDS ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. EDWARD A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act. He said: Mr. Speaker. For the third consecutive session I deem it my duty to press this measure upon the attention of the House. I should feel like apologizing to the House for taking up time with this matter did I not know that it is not my fault that it had not already been disposed of. I have discussed the principle of this Bill on the floor of this House and in the Railway Committee over and over again during these three sessions. We have discussed it, I am sorry to say, without getting any further on than we were at the beginning. The government has seen fit, on each occasion, to take some way of disposing of this Bill other than meeting it fairly and squarely and deciding for or against the principle. Two sessions ago, when the Bill was first brought up, I did not demur to its being sent to the Railway Committee, assuming that it would be considered in a reasonable way, brought down to the House in reasonable time and decided upon its merits. It went to the Railway Committee, therefore, I will not say with my actual consent, but without opposition on my part. In feeling that it was fair to give the government a trial with respect to it. But, in the Railway Committee, the government, with their majority, sent it to a small sub-committee, which disposed of it by reporting, practically, that it was not in the interest of the country to adopt it. That was adopted as a matter of course, first by the Railway Committee and then by this House, in consequence of the well known rule that the committees reports are to be adopted. Last session it came up in the same way, and on the second reading I felt it my duty to oppose it going to any Railway Committee, but it went in spite of the division that was taken, and it was there debated upon its merits to a considerable extent and was voted down, not on its merits, but in view of some promises made, some pledges of what would be done by the government in the meantime if it was allowed to stand. It was the opinion of the majority of the committee it should not be proceeded further with that session.

Now, sir, as you know, justice delayed is injustice, and we are here again another year without any expression of opinion against the merits of this Bill and without anything having been done. But I understand, and I want the Minister of Railways and Canals to correct me if I am wrong—I must be more or less uncertain about it until I see his Railway Bill, which has been read the first time