

Minister of Public Works had been able to infuse into his Department.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK said the hon. gentleman for South Waterloo was in too great a hurry to take credit to the Government. The fact was that last year they had increased the estimate by \$496,000, and this year they had reduced it about \$447,000, leaving a net increase over the highest estimate of the late Government of \$40,000.

Mr. YOUNG said the increase last year was accounted for by the changed system of making up the accounts, charged, as much of the expenditure was, to working expenses instead of capital account. Surely the hon. gentleman was not so ignorant as not to know of the mismanagement on the Intercolonial Railway which had been brought to light by Mr. BRYDGES. If he were acquainted with the facts, his temerity in challenging comparison was extraordinary. He (Mr. YOUNG) took for granted that the reduction accomplished by the Government was a *bona fide* one, while it was well-known that the increase last year was not due to any greater expenditure, but to a desire to have the expenditures which already existed charged to their proper account.

Mr. WRIGHT (Pontiac) would like to know whether the reduction was upon capital account or working expenses, because until that was explained, it was impossible to say whether the Government was worthy of praise or blame. If the diminution were chargeable to construction, he thought the eulogiums of the hon. member for South Waterloo were uncalled for, as there was nothing more natural, now that the road was finished, than that such a reduction should take place. He hoped soon to see the day when there would be no charge against the Intercolonial Railway except for running expenses.

Mr. DOMVILLE contended that the expenditures for several new works on the railway, to the amount of \$47,000 should have been charged to construction, whereas they had been charged to maintenance; the same principle, in his opinion, being applicable in this case by which merchants spread the expenses of starting in business over a series of years. He would like to know what had been done with the old rails taken up and replaced on what

was formerly known as the European and North American Railway.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said they were returned as "stores sold."

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL desired to know whether the amount realized was charged to cost or deducted from the actual expenditure of the year.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he was not quite sure but he would find out.

Mr. DOMVILLE maintained that there was no reduction but rather an increase in the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER asked the leader of the Government to postpone the discussion which he knew must take place upon this item because there were statements made in that regard, especially in the report laid before the country by Mr. BRYDGES, which his hon. friend could well understand it was quite impossible for him (Mr. TUPPER) to allow to pass without notice.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he was most willing that the hon. gentleman should have a chance of making any statement, or entering into any discussion on the subject he might desire.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL did not desire to enter into a discussion on this subject at the present stage, but the hon. member for South Waterloo had challenged comparison between the administration of the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway under Mr. BRYDGES and the present Government, and under the late Government. He did not desire to bring the name of Mr. BRYDGES before the Committee, but that gentleman's name having once been before us it was made public property. He (Mr. MITCHELL) was quite prepared to discuss the management of the Intercolonial Railway under both parties, and although it might be true that some of the things referred to by Mr. BRYDGES were open to criticism and censure, he held that Mr. BRYDGES should be subjected to the same treatment as Mr. CARVELL. He felt very doubtful whether in the end it would turn out whether the hon. member for South Waterloo had been wise in challenging this comparison.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said it seemed to him an extraordinary thing that the hon. gentleman should make an attack of this kind, particularly after having said that he did not intend to

Mr. Young.