

Lower Provinces would never have entered into a union, even those who were most strongly in favour of it, except on condition that the Government would give assistance in completing and running the Intercolonial Railway. I am not going to say by any means that the road is well run, because the hon. gentleman has demonstrated himself whether it is or not. He says that the men employed were not suitable, and it seems to me somewhat extraordinary that his predecessor in office did not know that. It is also strange that the gentleman who has a large salary at the head of that railway should employ men who are not suitable. I had always supposed that Mr. Schreiber was a man of some ability and that he knew a good railway man from a bad railway man, but now the Minister himself says that the men he employed are not suitable. I do not know that any member of the Opposition could have used harsher language than that in describing the manner in which the Intercolonial Railway has been conducted. Is the Minister discriminating now that he is dismissing these men among the suitable and unsuitable employes? Has he passed them through an examination, or taken their past record, and just dismissed these men who are not suitable? That would be a question worthy of some little investigation I think. His predecessor did not seem to have any idea of the suitability of the men engaged except from a political point of view: who was suitable to work upon the railway was not the question, but it was, whether he suited the particular person who wanted him appointed. I submit that this is just the weakness of the Intercolonial Railway, and as a representative of the Lower Provinces I regret this, because it brings us at once in conflict with our friends in Ontario, who say that this road is being used for political purposes, and who claim that it should be run on business principles. If the Minister is correct in the statement that the men are not suitable on the Intercolonial Railway, I can understand why he is applying the pruning knife, but if his complaint is that too many men have been employed, then it is a different matter altogether. I cannot understand the figures given by the hon. Minister when I compare them with the figures furnished by the Agriculture Department in the Canadian Statistical Year Book. The figures there are not all like those given by the Minister of Railways. I find here that the expenditure of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway is just 65 per cent of its income.

Mr. McALISTER. Does that include the whole of the railway?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, and they declare dividends. Now, I find on page 388 of that book, that on the Canada Atlantic system the earnings per mile were \$4,110, whereas the expense per mile is only \$2,479; of course there may be some little difference in the method of calculation, but I take this as correct. I find that on the Canada Southern the earnings per mile were \$12,272, and the expenditure only \$7,835.

Mr. HAGGART. I was giving you the train mileage.

Mr. FRASER. Surely the train mileage cannot be a sure test in investigating the truth as to what a railway costs?

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, yes.

Mr. FRASER. Does the method of calculation pursued by the Minister show that really the earnings in one case are greater or less than the earnings per mile given here, as compared with the expenses?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman may see that on a road 100 miles long there may be only one train a day, if there are 100 trains a day the earnings per mile may be 100 times as much.

Mr. FRASER. I can understand that.

Mr. HAGGART. And that the actual test, and the only one as to the efficiency of management or otherwise of the road, is the train mileage.

Mr. FRASER. Is it not as expensive in proportion when two trains run a day as if one train runs? I take it that this method of calculation is the better, and I find here that the Intercolonial Railway is the only railway in which its earnings per mile is not in excess of its expenses per mile. Be that as it may, to return to what I said. If the Minister of Railways is correct, he has demonstrated clearly that if this is a cheap road, he is all wrong in taking away any of these men unless they are unfit for the service or in stopping any of the rights that the people of the Lower Provinces now have in regard to the running of the trains. Let me ask why have these men been employed, if it is now necessary to discharge them, because the Minister knows that it is always difficult to deprive people of their situations once you employ them. It may be a small matter with the Minister of Railways, to dismiss 100 or 200, or 300 employes, but it would not seem to me a less serious affair than expending an immense sum of money for one single property in St. John, and expending \$400,000 for a station at Halifax. The Minister has not attempted to say that these men were unnecessary, but he says that they are not suitable, and that is the only reason he gives.

Mr. HAGGART. Did the hon. gentleman not hear me say that I had already reduced the number of trains, and if you have less trains won't you require less men?

Mr. FRASER. Decidedly, when the number of trains is reduced.

Mr. HAGGART. I have done that.

Mr. FRASER. I understood from the hon. gentleman that this is what he was going to do, but if he has done so, let me ask him if the number of men dismissed is proportionate to the number of trains that are stopped? Has he dismissed exactly the number of men that would be necessary to work the extra trains which were formerly run and which he now has stopped? Is that the gauge which the Minister has applied to the dismissal of these men? If so I could understand it. He has, he says, taken off the train from Halifax to St. John, I understand that that train cost about \$60,000 a year, but if I am wrong the Minister will correct me.

Mr. HAGGART. A good deal more, you are well within the mark.

Mr. FRASER. Well, let me say \$80,000. He has also taken off another train in Nova Scotia from Stellarton to Pictou, and I will place that at \$20,000. This is a saving of \$100,000 a year in Nova Scotia, but the Minister says he is going to save nearly \$500,000. Therefore, the other \$400,-