

the hon. gentleman, and I think his own recollection will corroborate what I have said, that such an estimate was procured, that it was placed in my hands by my officers, and that, if my memory serves me, such an estimate was placed before the investigating committee. If the hon. gentleman remembers the figures, the cost would be in excess of the cost of the permanent arrangement entered into at last.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is the cost, as estimated :

Cost of Drummond County Railway..	\$1,535,500
Ste. Rosalie to Drummondville.....	291,500
Drummondville to St. Léonard.....	304,000
St. Léonard to Chaudière Bridge....	770,000
Nicolet Branch	170,000

The other calculation was not on the basis of that estimate at all. According to the other calculation, the hon. gentleman intended to pay one-half of the road from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, and half of the terminals in the city of Montreal. The calculation which was handed to him was, that the Victoria bridge had cost the Grand Trunk Railway in the neighbourhood of \$12,000,000, and the estimated value of it then was from \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000. Then, I am to infer that the basis upon which he paid the Grand Trunk Railway Company, was the calculation of the value that was put upon it by the officers of the department. The officers of his department knew that a bridge for all the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway, and ten times over, could be built across the St. Lawrence for \$1,500,000. The hon. gentleman knows that the calculation was made upon the basis—if I remember aright, and I will have the details after dinner, for I intend to go specially into the subject—the calculation was made upon the basis of from eight to ten million dollars.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) must know that there were various calculations and various estimates of every possible kind made by the officers of the department, and what I am trying to point out to him is, that the particular kind of estimate which he said I could have got, I did get, and the figures are furnished to the committee.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is the sworn evidence of the hon. gentleman before the committee, exhibit 16, page 13 :

The cost of the construction of the bridge was, I think, \$10,000,000 ; it could now be completed for \$6,000,000.

That is Mr. Blair's sworn evidence before the committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What does that prove ?

Mr. HAGGART. It proves, as I say, that the evidence that was before you upon which you based your calculation of payment of the

Mr. HAGGART.

subsidy for each year to the Grand Trunk Railway, was based on some figures like that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that was all the evidence that was before me ?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not say anything of the kind. I should judge from the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) some time ago, to the effect that there was no evidence of any kind, that he was taking a leap in the dark.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you understood that, your mind was not working.

Mr. HAGGART. The evidence that was adduced before the Minister (Mr. Blair), and the only evidence that I know of that he gave before the committee in reference to the value of the bridge across the St. Lawrence, was a statement which is now in the office of Mr. Panet, clerk of the committee, that the bridge cost in the neighbourhood of \$10,000,000, and that it could probably be built now for \$6,000,000. Mr. Schreiber, the Deputy Minister, knows perfectly well that for one-fourth of this estimate a bridge could be built there. He knew that he had the evidence that the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge cost only \$1,500,000, and he knew that such a bridge could be built at the present day for \$1,200,000. Yet the Minister led the committee to believe that the basis of his calculation was a bridge that cost \$10,000,000, which could now be built for \$6,000,000. He would need a better basis than that, and more enormous figures for the payment of \$5,000,000 for the purpose of building into Montreal. I have stated before—and we must have this information before concurrence, and before this bridge Bill becomes law the information in reference to it—I have stated here, that I have information from nearly every railway throughout the country, and I make the bold statement now, that the books of the Intercolonial Railway are kept in such a manner that the Minister can bring down to this House the receipts and expenditure on every section of the road. That is done on the Grand Trunk Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Done everywhere.

Mr. HAGGART. It is done on the Canadian Pacific Railway ; it is done on the Canada Atlantic Railway, and it is done on the Intercolonial Railway. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) was correcting and contradicting the statements that were made by the Montreal "Star," the leader of the Opposition told him that the accounts on the Intercolonial Railway were so prepared. Is it not more probable that the statement of the leader of the Opposition is correct, the statement of the Minister of Railways to the contrary.