

expenses, and station and train expenses. How is the saving on locomotive power to be effected?

Mr. POPE. I am informed that that is expected to result from the heavier new engines which we are putting on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you expect less traffic?

Mr. POPE. No; but we expect the greater power of the engines will enable us to do the traffic with less expense than we did before.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How many of these powerful engines have you got more than last year?

Mr. POPE. We have about 60.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Between last year and this? I notice that the expenditure was \$820,000 for last year and \$720,000 for this?

Mr. POPE. We got five or six new ones between last year and this, and the old ones have been put in very much better repair.

Mr. MACKENZIE. So each of these new and powerful engines is to save you \$20,000 a year?

Mr. POPE. We think, as the old engines are in so much better repair and we have so many new ones, that the traffic will cost us that much less.

Mr. BLAKE. It is pretty difficult to apprehend from the hon. gentleman's statements, what the real condition of things is. A little while ago, the hon. gentleman made a statement, which had often been made by Sir Charles Tupper, namely, that the rolling stock of the Intercolonial Railway was always kept up to the handle—that the engineers were not allowed to fall back at all, and this was done at the expense of revenue. Now he says that he is going to save \$100,000 this year on locomotive power, because the engines are in so much better repair than last year, so it would appear that they were in a state of disrepair last year. If you have 160 engines or so in the regular course of things, some of them will be wearing out more or less, occasionally one will get smashed from accidents, and so on. But as I understand the rule of the road is that whenever an engine gets behind in efficiency and requires repair, or when an accident happens, the engine is taken in and made right again. If this is so, I do not see how they could have been so much worse last year than this, that you will save \$100,000 on locomotive expenses.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman knows that when an engine gets old and is in its last day, it costs more to keep it in repair than a new one. The Minister states that he has put out of use a number of these old engines, and is getting new ones, and the expenses required to keep these new ones up to the standard will be much less than the old ones, which were finally condemned and put out of use, and therefore there will be a less expenditure for locomotive power.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman knows that an estimate is one thing and actual expenditure is another. Last year we actually expended \$750,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have the expenses then up to the 1st of July. We would like to know the scale of expenses up to that date.

Mr. POPE. We have not got it.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman said a moment ago that it was \$750,000 and he must have it or he could not have stated it. He could not have been prophesying when he told us the exact expenditure.

Mr. POPE. We have not got it this year. I gave the hon. gentleman what it was the year before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The normal expenditure seems to be about that amount all the time. In 1883 it was \$767,062, so that the hon. gentleman last year took \$60,000 more than the normal amount, and now he claims to be saving so much.

Mr. POPE. I cannot speak as to 1883.

Mr. BLAKE. Could the hon. gentleman state the average price of coal supplied to the Intercolonial Railway last year for locomotive purposes.

Mr. POPE. I am informed about \$2.70.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is impossible. When I left office I let several contracts at \$1.59.

Mr. POPE. The figure I gave includes handling, and so forth.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it supplied under contract?

Mr. POPE. It is now.

Mr. BLAKE. With several mining establishments or with one?

Mr. POPE. Two this year.

Mr. BLAKE. Was any tender made?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And is the coal delivered at the pit mouth and handled by the Intercolonial Railway from the pit mouth, or how is that?

Mr. POPE. It is delivered at the junction on the Intercolonial Railway cars.

Mr. BLAKE. Which mines have the contract?

Mr. POPE. The Spring Hill and the Pictou.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the contract price?

Mr. POPE. The Pictou mine, \$1.55, and the other, \$1.83.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the price which the Intercolonial Railway pays for the coal is \$1.55 and \$1.83, but the price at which it is charged in the working expenses is \$2.73, the difference being the estimated cost of handling. Of course, there would be the cost of putting it into the Intercolonial cars at the pit. The cost of transporting it to the point of consumption, and the cost of loading it from time to time into the engine on which it was consumed; but how this would amount to \$1.18 a ton I cannot understand.

Mr. POPE. It is calculated that the transport costs 50 cents, and the handling 87 cents more.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the average of the mileage of that 50 cents haul?

Mr. POPE. I could not say; the calculation is made over the whole road.

Mr. PAINT. What is the total yearly consumption?

Mr. POPE. I think the contract for this year was for 140,000 tons.

Mr. SHANLY. I presume the whole road is now worked by coal?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Eastern Extension Railway \$ 75,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the special reason for separating this? Is it not part of the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. POPE. It never has been included in the Intercolonial Railway, because we have been operating it for a short time, and we may not, perhaps, operate it very long; I do not know as to that. If I had put the accounts together, I have no doubt the hon. member for West Durham would