

\$290,115, showing earnings per train mile of \$1.02; the Canada Atlantic, 138 miles of road, in operation, train mileage 428,816, earnings \$558,831, or \$1.30. I need not give the mileage, as I have already given it, but will just give the names of the roads and their earnings and the amount per train mile. The Canada Southern earns \$4,408,964, or \$1.35 per train mile; the Intercolonial Railway, 1,094 miles, \$2,977,395, and the earnings per train mile only 59 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You stated the expenses at 72 cents.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, a loss on every train mile of 13 cents. The Prince Edward Island, 210 miles, total amount earned \$174,258 at the end of June, 1891, which gives 65 cents per train mile; the Canadian Pacific Railway, 5,537 miles, earnings \$18,672,174, or \$1.35 per train mile; the Central Ontario, 104 miles, earnings \$87,925, giving 80 cents per train mile; the Grand Trunk Railway, 3,143 miles, earnings \$17,423,860, earnings per train mile \$1.05; the Kingston and Pembroke, 76 cents per train mile; the Manitoba and South-Western, \$1.62 per train mile; the North Pacific and Manitoba, \$1.03 per train mile; the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake, 73 cents per train mile; the Quebec and Lake St. John, 74 cents per train mile; the Quebec Central, 96 cents per train mile; the South Eastern, \$1 per train mile; the Windsor and Annapolis, \$1.41.

Mr. BORDEN. I did not catch the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Mileage, 5,537, train miles run 13,754,014, earnings \$18,672,174, earnings per train mile \$1.35. Then I have a table showing the total tonnage of coal carried and the total tonnage of ocean-borne freight *via* Halifax, and the amount of grain received at Halifax for export in each of the following years:—From 1876 to 1881-82 there was nothing. In 1882 there was 31,000 bushels; in 1883, 73,000 bushels; in 1884, 300,000 bushels; in 1885, 389,000; in 1886, 575,000; in 1887, 69,000; in 1888, 129,000; in 1889, 502,000; in 1890-91, 218,000. This year I believe the amount will exceed 1,000,000 bushels—in fact about 1,300,000 bushels. Then there is the quantity of raw and refined sugar carried.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) If the quantity increases very much, it will kill you outright.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, the more we carry the worse off we are in most of these articles. There is a statement here of the quantity of fresh and salt fish carried, and the earnings and working expenses for the eight months ending 29th February, 1892. Amount of mileage in operation, 1,145; earnings, \$1,947,211.17; working expenses, \$2,613,265.50; and the loss on the eight months is \$666,054.33 up to the 1st of March. From the 1st of March up to the present, I think the loss will be nothing.

Mr. GIBSON. Upon what class of freight do they make the greatest loss? I see the loss is 13¢ per ton per mile.

Mr. HAGGART. The greatest loss has been on the carrying of coal, the carrying of stone, and the carrying of wheat.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. Minister of Railways in his statement has told us, and has now repeated

in reply to the hon. gentleman who just put the question across the House, that one of the causes of the deficit in the management of the Intercolonial Railway, which, of course, we all regret, is that we are carrying certain products of the country at exceptionally low rates, and he instanced the rates charged on coal, flour and grain. We know that coal is carried over the Intercolonial Railway at the rate of $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent per ton per mile. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to look at the report of the Department of Railways, they will find that in the years 1889 and 1890 we have carried 294,879 tons of coal. That is all the coal which has been carried west of Chaudière over the Intercolonial Railway in those years. The value of that I estimate to be about \$589,758.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Does the hon. gentleman take in the two years?

Mr. KENNY. I do, 1889 and 1890. During these two years the Intercolonial Railway has carried 2,129,169 barrels of flour, and 5,501,123 bushels of grain. Of course all that traffic came from west of Chaudière. The weight of that flour in tons would be 212,916 tons, and the weight of the grain would be 137,528 tons, or a gross weight of flour and grain amounting to 350,444 tons. Therefore, if there has been a loss in the transportation of these articles at an exceptionally low rate, it is due more to the fact that we are carrying flour and grain than to the fact that we have carried coal, because we have carried a great deal more flour and grain than we have coal. Then, look at the value of the articles that have been so carried. The coal, as I have already said, is worth about \$589,758. The flour would amount in value to \$9,581,260. The 5,000,000 bushels of grain I estimate to be worth \$2,750,561, making a total value of flour and grain of \$12,331,821. Now, I desire to show the committee and certain hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are very fond of saying here and elsewhere that this great tax of the Intercolonial Railway is borne by the people of Canada solely in the interest of the Maritime Provinces. It is thus evident that the quantity of flour and grain which the Intercolonial Railway carries at exceptionally low rates—as low, if not lower, than the coal is carried—is immensely in excess in value over the coal which is carried west of Chaudière. The value of the coal does not amount to \$600,000, whereas the flour and grain is valued at more than \$12,000,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Where do the flour and grain go?

Mr. KENNY. No doubt much of it is shipped out of the country, and a large portion is consumed in the Maritime Provinces. The hon. member must know that nearly every barrel of flour that is consumed by the people of the Maritime Provinces comes from Ontario, and we are glad to know that we can buy it cheaper and of as good quality from Ontario than we can get it from the United States. Our desire should be to encourage as much as possible this interprovincial traffic. I am not finding any fault with the rates at which these western productions are carried. I think it is in the interest of Canada that we should preserve this traffic for our own railways and our own means of transportation, because there is a possibility that, if we do not do so, the traffic would be carried over American railroads and by steamers at as low a rate.