

year they expended also \$428,000 in the construction of rolling stock, a large portion of which is also chargeable to this carriage of coal, and in addition to this, they have to provide what the chief superintendent calls "stable room" for this rolling stock; so you find that we have \$500,000 paid out for rolling stock alone, the larger portion of which is chargeable to this policy of carrying coal at non-paying rates. Therefore, I think the country is paying pretty dearly for the Springfield coal mines. I think it would be better to buy out the whole Springfield mines, to pay all the shareholders the value of their stock and to keep the men employed now in idleness for the rest of their lives. Why, this comes to nearly a million of money, adding the loss on the running expenses to the \$500,000 we have to pay out for rolling stock which is properly chargeable to this cause. It makes over \$900,000 during the last year, and I say the policy of the Government in continuing to carry that coal at non-paying rates cannot be defended. Still further, while we are incurring this enormous expenditure of rolling stock on the Intercolonial, we are at the same time spending millions in the construction of competing lines to destroy the trade of the Intercolonial. What will be the use of the money we are spending on that road and on the rolling stock when we know that the freight will naturally go by the shortest route, so that the Intercolonial will be kept up for the use of the Springhill coal mines, and for that only. I suppose that some day we will have a proposition made to present the Intercolonial to the Springhill coal owners. It seems to be run in their interests now, and the result is that an increase in the coal traffic is not a blessing but a curse to the country, because the more they carry the greater is the loss. I submit these figures to show that the Government, when they reconsidered their policy and revised their rates, and stopped making this difficulty, took a very wise course; and it appears there was political influence enough on the benches behind the Government to compel them to alter their course. It was stated here this afternoon that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) kicked hard, that he would not come into the traces at all, until they went back to the old system and revised the rate to what it is now, $\frac{3}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile. I have asked a number of engineers and others engaged in railway operations about this matter, and I don't think that in any other part of the world a parallel can be produced where a railway carries coal, or a bulky article like coal, at anything like the ruinous rate at which they have been carrying coal from the Springhill mines.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a matter connected with my county about which I want to make some observations. I moved for some papers in connection with two or three claims that some of my constituents have on the Derby branch of the Intercolonial Railway; and I stated some time ago when I withdrew four of these notices, that some of these matters had been settled and in three more a sum was offered which my constituents refused to accept. With respect to four of these cases, they are settled, and I have nothing more to say; but I want to say this in reference to the case of Mr. George Knight. Mr. Knight had a living spring and brook which took its rise on the side of a hill just in front of his house, and ran from there towards the river, within about one-eighth of a mile, or thereabouts, of the Derby branch of the Intercolonial Railway. The authorities of the Intercolonial came and took that man's spring and built a tank over it and absorbed the whole of it, covering up the brook through his meadow for about one-eighth of a mile, and they have refused to pay him any damages for it. Mr. Knight claimed \$2,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I tell you it is not a small thing for a farmer who keeps a large stock of cattle and horses, to have to drive them in the

winter season one-eighth of a mile to the river, and out a hole in the ice where they may drink. In the course of that operation one of his cows slipped on the ice and he lost her. Hon. gentlemen may laugh at that kind of a thing. It is very easy for my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who is getting all he wants done, railways built here and there and everywhere, getting the ear of the Government in such a way that he can get anything settled that he wants. But in the case of Mr. Knight his spring was entirely taken away from him, and he is put to great inconvenience for the want of it. The Government offered him \$50 for his land damages and for taking away his spring and brook. I hold that was entirely unreasonable. The other day the right hon. gentleman referred these matters to the Minister of Public Works to confer with me with a view to settlement, and I thought that Mr. Knight ought to accept \$500. The Minister of Public Works, with Mr. Schreiber, thought that \$250 was enough. Now, Sir, I know that \$250 is not enough. I consented to make the offer to Mr. Knight, and I wrote to him telling him I had done the best I could, and suggesting that rather than have a law suit in the Exchequer Court, he had better accept it. He wrote me back saying that he would lose the whole money before he would accept it. I think he is fairly entitled to get remuneration to the extent of \$500, and in my opinion the man has been damaged to a greater extent than that for the reason that he has to drive his cattle during the whole winter season once or twice a day, down to the river where he has to cut a hole in the ice in order that they may drink. If the gentleman who controls that railway saw this man driving his cattle in the winter time down to the river, as I have seen farmers do, I think he would not have been so hard about it. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Schreiber, who controls this railway, is as hard as flint. He has no consideration for these poor people at all. All he cares about is to save a few dollars for the Government. I think that the right hon. gentleman will do well to reconsider this case, and to ask his acting Deputy Minister of Public Works again to look into the matter, and to see whether the statement that I am making is correct, as I know it to be, and I think he will agree that the man is fairly entitled to \$500 for the damages he has sustained. Then with regard to another case, that of George R. Parker. I have not the evidence so clear about that. Mr. Parker states to me that the sum of \$200 which has been paid him, and for which they have taken a receipt, is not for his land damages by the railway at all, but it is for damages to his house, which he had to move back and dig a new cellar, for which they gave him \$200 as per contract. With regard to another case, that of Mr. Samuel Russell, we fixed upon a sum of \$400 or \$500. Mr. Russell declined to accept the \$400. Mr. Schreiber has made a report upon it, in which he speaks of a receipt in full for claims and damages. Mr. Russell alleges that he never gave his receipt in full for any land damages. The receipt was for a contract job to do a certain work. I am not able to state that Mr. Russell is entitled to \$2,000—I do not think he is entitled to that much—but I do think he is fairly entitled to \$600 or \$700 for the damages sustained. He keeps a store on the spot, with a public-house and a blacksmith shop, and they have stopped up all approach from the river to Mr. Russell's premises, and it will cost him \$700 or \$800 at least to make a landing, to say nothing of the damages he has sustained. Now, I would like the Minister either to give these three cases his personal attention, or to ask the Minister of Public Works to confer with the railway authorities in regard to them. There is another case, that of Thomas Flynn. When water was carried to the railway station at Newcastle they dug through the whole length of his farm, several acres, and threw up the shell rock and thus spoiled a considerable extent of land, and for this damage they never paid him a cent. The