

the road, on account of political or any other purposes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), when he made that statement, had Mr. Pottinger, the superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, and he had the deputy of his department, he had them to refer to to prove the incorrectness of the statement he made, that any one was employed on the Intercolonial Railway for political purposes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have given personal attention for several years to the enormous number of employees on the Intercolonial Railway, and I submitted to the House a comparative statement of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, which showed that far more men were employed per mile on the Intercolonial Railway than on either of the other two. It is admitted on all hands that the Intercolonial Railway has been over-manned for years, and I am glad that the Minister of Railways has announced that he has dismissed a large number of employees, and thus relieved the country of an enormous drain for supporting this road.

Mr. COCHRANE. It will be like the Customs Department; they will weed out some and appoint more.

Cornwall Canal..... \$145,600

Mr. HAGGART. The Sheik's Island dam on the Cornwall Canal is now about to be completed. Has the Minister any reports in his department on this. I believe the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) visited that place himself, and I would like him to state whether he thinks that work is for the benefit of the public or whether the expenditure on it is also for the advantage of the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) was advised by the officers of his department that the work done on the Cornwall Canal was necessary and proper. I am not going to make any assault upon the policy which the hon. gentleman pursued in that regard. He appears to be very anxious that I should assail him.

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no desire to do it. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) that I am not going to be drawn, at this moment, into any criticism of the course he pursued, nor do I think that he ought to insist upon me expressing very high commendation. I am willing to leave his work as he directed it to be done, and as it was done, and I am content to pass no opinion upon it one way or the other. I think he ought to be perfectly willing that I should assume that attitude.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. BRITTON. In this vote there is a claim of \$600 for interest, which matured in 1887. If it was a just claim it would appear to one not acquainted with the facts that it should be paid by the late Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have carefully considered this matter, and I have come to the conclusion that that \$600 ought to be paid to Mr. Smith. The claim is of long standing, but it is one that should not be prejudiced by reason of the delay in paying it. Mr. Smith was adjudged a considerable amount for land damages, but he refused to accept the principal as a final settlement of his claim, contending that he was entitled to interest from the time the property was practically expropriated by the Crown. Others under similar circumstances had been paid interest. The matter dragged along until the interest increased to about \$1,200. It remained unadjusted until the change of Government, when an Order in Council was passed by the late Government on the 8th July, 1896, giving Mr. Smith half the interest which he claimed. He then refused to take it, but recently he has expressed his willingness to accept the \$600 in full payment for his claim for interest. The amount ought to be paid him.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not finding fault with this, but Mr. Smith gave a conveyance in full to the Government for \$4,000. Perhaps he had a mental reservation in his mind at the time about interest. He claimed the interest from me. But my answer was, here is your conveyance for the money you agreed to take. I suppose that was your intention at the time you agreed to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know Mr. Smith personally, except that I have met him since this matter came up. The sum was offered to him, and he was told that unless he accepted it on the terms offered, that is, without interest, he would not get his money, and he accepted it. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that he did not maintain the attitude he has stated he maintained, because he himself recommended it to Council, and on the strength of his recommendation, Council passed an order on the 8th of July, 1896, for the payment to Mr. Smith of \$600. He has quite overlooked that fact, but that is the fact.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember anything of the kind. If the hon. gentleman has it there, with my signature, it is correct; but I do not remember that I recommended any such Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the Order in Council, but I know that it was passed on the 8th of July, I presume on the recommendation of the hon. gentleman.