

ment of the road during the time when I was in charge of it, and when he was in charge of it. I will tell the hon. gentleman that the reference which he made to me, the other evening, was quite uncalled for, when he said that, when I was in charge of the department, in order to make a surplus for that year, the expenditure that ought to have taken place before the 1st of July, was deferred until a later period, and that, when the hon. gentleman came into power, he had to put it into its normal condition, and that accounts for the enormous difference between his expenditure, as compared with the expenditure during the year of my management of the railway. The hon. gentleman might as well, with equal truth, say, that he is making all the expenditures on the repairs for the present year and charging everything he can to capital account, caring nothing whatever for any deficit this year, in order that he may have a favourable statement to show the people of the country when he goes to the elections, in a year or two from now. He does not care: he can stand all these charges against himself of raising the rates on the Intercolonial Railway; he does not mind how much is expended on capital or revenue account, provided that, when the time comes that an appeal is made to the country, he can show a surplus greater than all of the surpluses that ever occurred on the Intercolonial Railway. That is a system that I cannot understand in reference to the expenditures. Surely, the expenditure accrues in the next year; that was borne in the beginning of the year he mentioned. The receipts for the two years following the year he mentioned show that the revenue was greater than the expenditure for these two or three years at least, so that the hon. gentleman could have no fault to find. What the hon. gentleman seems to say is, that the expenditure in the first year should have been in a particular portion of the year, and he justified his expenditure by saying that in the first year he restored it to its normal condition by making the expenditure at the proper time. I doubt that. I gave no instructions to any officer of the Intercolonial, while I was managing the road, to do any such thing as the hon. gentleman has stated. My instructions to the officers of the Intercolonial Railway were, to keep up the standard of efficiency in the best possible manner, to see that the rolling stock and the road did not degenerate, and that the road was equipped in the most efficient manner. I am astonished at the lavish expenditure for cars which is now going on, in view of the fact that, when I was in the department, the officers informed me that they were not necessary at all. The officers of my department told me that, if arrangements were made for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway for the purpose of getting into the city of Montreal, there was such a big surplus of rolling stock on the Intercol-

onial that we would not need to buy one single passenger car or locomotive. It was on this ground that I made the statement before the committee, that I did not expect to make an expenditure for establishing that connection of more than \$1,500,000. I never would have thought of giving \$5,000,000 for that connection from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal. Why did not the hon. gentleman do as other railways do that are travelling into Montreal—secure the user of the Grand Trunk Railway for the Intercolonial, and get the terminals on a wheelage basis, or a basis of user? Would not that have been a proper arrangement? Do not other railways adopt that system? The Grand Trunk Railway Company were willing to arrange with him on that basis. I could have made an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the basis of user, and we could have found out from the Delaware and Hudson, the Central Vermont and other lines of railway that are running into Montreal, what they pay. Every one of them pays on a basis of user, or wheelage, for the right of going into the station. The same thing obtains in every part of America, and the hon. Minister could easily have found out what the cost would be. Have the officers of the Government made an estimate of the amount of the user that the Intercolonial would make of the terminals of the bridge and of the road to St. Lambert? They could have told the hon. gentleman within a few thousands of dollars what he would have had to pay.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman be surprised, when I inform him that such an examination was made, such an estimate was made, and such figures were put in my hands, and, if my recollection serves me, they were furnished to the committee of investigation?

Mr. HAGGART. I am not surprised, in view of the figures, when I remember that one of the estimates of the value of the Victoria bridge was \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000, and that we were to pay for the user of that bridge, for the half user—no, not for the half user, but for the fiftieth user—three or four million dollars.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is not doing himself justice now. I was not speaking about the estimate of the cost of the Victoria bridge, nor was he. I was speaking of the estimate of the terminals.

Mr. HAGGART. I was.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will see that he is quite in error. He was speaking of the Government procuring an estimate in reference to the probable cost, upon a wheelage basis, of running the Intercolonial into the city of Montreal. I have stated to