

out. I deemed it part of my duty, as representative of the county of Two Mountains, to resist the proposal to put that prosperous district in the hands of such a man; and so deep is my belief, that I would not hesitate in case of need to take once more the same stand.

In conclusion, I beg of the government to revoke the subsidies already granted and lapsed. They are as follows:—

First, 49 Vic., cap. 10, p. 74, which reads: 'For a railway from St. Eustache to St. Placide, county of Two Mountains, 18 miles, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, and not exceeding altogether \$57,600.'

Secondly, 51-52 Vic., cap. 27, p. 98, as herewith: 'To the Carillon and Grenville Railway Company, for 12 miles of railway from St. Eustache to Sault au Recollet, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, and not exceeding altogether \$38,400.'

Thirdly, 55-56 Vic., cap. 5, p. 47, as herewith: 'For a railway from St. Placide to St. Andrew's, 8 miles, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile and not exceeding altogether \$25,600.'

The first grant, that for \$57,600, was voted in 1886, and revoked in 1892. By reviving that subsidy as well as the two others I have mentioned, the government would only be doing justice to the farmers of the counties of Argenteuil, Two Mountains and Laval, and would facilitate the building of the railway asked for by that part of the country. As I have already stated in this House and before the Railway Committee, the carrying through of this undertaking has become a necessity, in view of the remarkable progress and development which have taken place in these localities of recent years. I am confident that by so doing, that is by reviving these grants on behalf of any company having a charter and sufficient means or of any other company which might be formed and would offer the same security to the public, there would not be wanting reliable men, such as those with whom we are negotiating, who would be in a position to carry out the undertaking, and thereby, satisfy the just and legitimate ambition of the people of the county of Two Mountains.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of vindicating the papers which my hon. friend has criticised so harshly. I read the articles which appeared in 'La Patrie' and 'Le Journal.' They comment on the stand taken by my hon. friend regarding the Bill which I had the honour to submit to the consideration of this House. Likely, the criticism contained in these articles reflecting on the stand taken by the member for Two Mountains (a stand which cannot be defended on any ground), was very much to the point, and on that account, and also in view of the uneasiness and discontent prevailing in his constituency, my hon. friend has thought proper to make a further

attempt to explain his point of view, but without success.

The hon. member states that he is favourable to the building of a line of railway similar to that outlined in the Bill which I submitted to the consideration of the House. He was in favour and he is still to-day in favour of that line.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER. (Translation.) I never said that I was in favour of the Bill introduced by my hon. friend. I stated before the Railway Committee,—and my hon. friend must remember,—that I would support the motion of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in order to enable the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to obtain the required information to answer the objections raised by Mr. Armstrong's name being mentioned in the Bill. That was on June 30th last. I stated before the committee that it was only fair that the promoter of the Bill should be allowed to get the information required by those who had put him in charge of it; and I requested that the consideration of the Bill be postponed for a week, reserving my right to resist later on the application of its promoters.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) The hon. member stated that he had asked for time to inquire into the merits of the promoters of this Bill.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I did not ask for time to inquire; but I requested the committee to grant time to the hon. member, promoter of the Bill, to examine it and obtain information.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) At any rate my hon. friend reached the conclusion that the promoters of the Bill were shameless speculators. I am unable to thank my hon. friend. He considers me evidently as a shameless speculator. The same would apply to the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Leonard), who, surely, was interested solely as member for Laval, being anxious to have this railway go through his county. And the stigma would attach to the name even of the member sitting by his side; the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) who supported the Bill.

Now, does my hon. friend contend seriously that the list of shareholders certified by the secretary of the company contains the names of shameless speculators only? Does he consider that Mr. McMullen, an American, who holds much the larger part of the shares, is a brazen-faced speculator? Far from it, Mr. McMullen is a respectable citizen of the neighbouring republic, a man occupying a high position which surely puts him beyond the reach of my hon. friend. Mr. McMullen has had interviews with the government and with the right hon. the Prime Minister himself, and I have reason to believe that he was very well received. If actually he was a man connected with all kinds of suspicious speculations, how is it