

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Although the late Government set the bad example of entertaining these old claims, I am systematically refusing them.

255. Intercolonial Railway—To pay legal expenses in the matter of the Western Counties Railway Company and the Attorney-General of Canada, vs. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company.....\$589.90

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the legal expenses for contesting the case against the Crown, on the petition of right which was granted to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me to be an extraordinary charge to be made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must know that the Windsor Branch forms no part of the Intercolonial Railway. It is not in our hands, the property is virtually out of the hands of the Government, and yet we are in that position, that we are obliged to defend the action brought against us by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company. I could not charge this to the operating expenses of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not venture to suggest to which road he should charge it; that is another consideration. I venture to suggest that this has nothing to do with the Capital Account of the Intercolonial. It is a suit which is brought against the Government in regard to the Windsor Branch. Why should it be charged to Capital Account?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because the Windsor Branch is technically a part of the Intercolonial and there are no operating charges.

Mr. BLAKE. I never heard of such a proposal as this, that the costs of law suits, occurring long after the construction of the railway, should be charged against Capital Account.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know that technically, it is properly charged. But I say this, that if a party claimed a foot of the Intercolonial Railway to-day and we were obliged to resist the claim, under what head should it be charged? I say, to Capital Account. We own the road and have built it, and such a charge would have to be placed against Capital Account. In this case it cannot be placed against running expenses, and I am not particular under what other heading it is charged.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is particularly anxious that amounts should not be charged against the running expenses of the Intercolonial. In the Tiebborne case a special Act had to be obtained to charge the cost of the defence against the estate because money could not be obtained in other quarters. The Intercolonial Railway, however, is not in such a deplorable condition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The late Government took the Windsor Branch out of the hands of the Windsor and Annapolis Company, by force, and handed it over to another company. The first-named company has filed a petition of right. This money is paid for the defence, if damages, to the extent of \$100,000, are given in consequence of the action of the late Government. I ask the hon. gentleman whether it could legitimately be charged to the working expenses of the Intercolonial, of which the Windsor Branch technically forms a part.

Mr. BLAKE. As the Windsor Branch belongs to another company, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, what has it to do with the Intercolonial?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because it is still, technically, part of the Intercolonial.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has said it was handed over to another company. Then, it was not part of the Intercolonial.

256. Intercolonial Railway—Rivière du Loup Branch
—Repairs and improvements, land claims, &c...\$2,000.00

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have repeatedly demanded that a small station be built at Elgin for the accommodation of the travelling public. The only accommodation there at present is furnished by a private house, the Government paying for the use of part of it for the use of passengers. The owner is licensed to retail spirituous liquors, and it is understood that on the railway the Government are anxious that liquor should not be sold at any of the stations. Some abuses have occurred at this place on account of persons being drunk at the station. Suitable accommodation should be provided for from \$800 to \$1,000. This expenditure is necessary in the interests of travellers, and should be made without delay, especially in view of the fact that no less than \$420,000 have been voted for accommodation at other points of the road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will be very glad to make the closest enquiry into this matter, and will be only too glad to find that the traffic of the locality will warrant the expenditure necessary to provide the accommodation which the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. LAURIER. Does this include anything connected with the expropriation of land for the St. Charles Branch?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it the intention of the Government to take an appropriation for that object?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have done so already.

Mr. BLAKE. How does this come out of Capital Account?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a provision to pay accounts constantly coming in, with relation to work that was done, when this road was put in order. It is not for any current repairs at all, but for old accounts that were incurred under an appropriation for that purpose.

257. Intercolonial Railway—To pay claim of C. H. Mann.....\$3,162.19

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is to settle a claim arising out of a contract with Mann, for the construction of snow-sheds and fences along the line of the Intercolonial. On the 12th of May, 1881, the arbitrators awarded him \$3,821, which included \$829.23 as interest for six years; but the hon. Minister of Justice stated that, according to law, interest could not be paid, and Mann accepted the principal by letter, dated 4th of August, 1882. An Order in Council, August 25th, 1882, recommends the placing in the Supplementary Estimates, of the principal, \$2,895.60, and interest at 6 per cent. from the 4th of August, 1882, the date of Mann's letter, notifying his acceptance of the offer to the date of payment; say eleven months, \$166.59.

Mr. BLAKE. When was this contract finished?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At the end of 1875.

Mr. BLAKE. How came it to be so long unsettled?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is not so very long for such matters. These claims are pressed and resisted until finally, as the hon. gentleman sees, they are disposed of by being referred to arbitrators. The latter made an award, and, of course, there is nothing but to pay it.

Mr. BLAKE. I admit that it is not so very long in connection with a Government, but if money were owing to you or me, we would think it a very long time. For seven years it is pressed and pressed, and resisted and resisted, until it is at last referred, and then paid.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Sometimes these claims are referred and refused. I may take this opportunity of saying, that I have watched very closely the awards made by