

put on teams, hauled the stuff ten or twelve miles to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and loaded it in Canadian National cars on the Canadian Pacific track. These cars could have been switched with proper management to the Canadian National and the Canadian National would have got the freight. The result has been that the profit has been eaten up by the Canadian Pacific Railway, when the stuff was hauled in Canadian National cars but carried on the Canadian Pacific road. The management said that they could not get the cars. The same thing occurred in regard to potatoes and hay, farmers hauling their produce alongside the St. John and Quebec road, and loading on the Canadian Pacific siding in Canadian National cars, having been told by the management that they could not provide Canadian National cars for their own road.

There is still another condition. This road is not built to its northern extremity and connected with the Transcontinental. Neither is it built into the port of St. John. It runs for the last ten miles to St. John down the west side of the river. Potatoes and hay shipped to St. John for export are loaded on the boats at West St. John, but owing to the fact that no sidings were provided at West St. John for switching cars of freight for the docks to be loaded on the boats, it is taken to East St. John across the bridge at the Reversible Falls. I believe there is a toll on that bridge of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per 100 pounds. This toll has to be paid both ways. It goes to the yard in East St. John in the first place, and later, owing to the fact that the Canadian National Railways have no facilities for switching at West St. John, they pay the Canadian Pacific 3 cents a hundred for switching the cars back to the port of West St. John. Then they pay the Canadian Pacific Railway 3 cents terminal charges, because the Canadian Pacific does the switching and unloading.

I want to cite a concrete instance. Let us take a car of potatoes from Woodstock. The freight is $16\frac{1}{2}$ cents per 100 pounds from Woodstock to St. John. Out of that $16\frac{1}{2}$ cents freight from Woodstock to St. John, you have to pay the bridge toll of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a hundred each way, making a total of 3 cents for switching, and then there is 3 cents for terminal charges. That brings the charges up to 9 cents, to be taken out of the $16\frac{1}{2}$, which leaves the St. John and Quebec Railway $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents, although they do all the hauling, except the switching on to the dock. They pay over to the Canadian Pacific 9 cents a hundred out of the $16\frac{1}{2}$ cents on every car of potatoes which goes to West St. John for shipment.

These are things which should be remedied and could be remedied. I hope the minister will bring this matter to the attention of the management of the road.

We will admit they have taken this road out of politics. A private citizen cannot go to the management of the road and get them to do anything. For instance, a mill man who could not get cars on the St. John and Quebec Railway, on going to the Canadian National management, was curtly informed that there were no cars, although at the time Canadian National cars were being loaded on the Canadian Pacific track. I hope this matter will be brought to the attention of the management, and some effort made to have the bridge replaced north of Woodstock, so that the farmers and shippers who have potatoes that are perishable in storage may be able to get them shipped out before they are spoiled, because they will not be worth shipping by the 1st of July.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will bring the remarks of my hon. friend to the attention of the management to-morrow.

Mr. BAXTER: Perhaps the minister can give me an answer now in reference to the train shed at St. John. Does he know whether the president or board of directors or somebody has arranged for the building of a new station there?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, it is not provided for in this estimate, I am afraid.

Mr. HANSON: Is there any provision for renewing the bridge at Fredericton? The minister may not know, but that bridge was built in 1887 by the late Senator Temple, and it is now considered too light for the class of locomotives that have to go over it, with the result that all the trains passing over that now have to be hauled by small engines. Large engines cannot go over the bridge across the river. The matter has been under consideration, and we have been waiting for more than three years. Could the minister say whether a new bridge is contemplated there?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no provision in the estimates for that.

Mr. BAXTER: If the minister does not want us to continue with this general item, I will not press it now. I can ask the question again.

The CHAIRMAN: This is a general item, 139 under which all those items may be discussed.

Mr. BAXTER: Will that new station be dealt with in the Supplementary Estimates,