

accommodation. One of these is the plan proposed by the city council, which is the expropriation of all that block of property between Cornwallis street and the station.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is taking a block of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  acres.

Mr. HAGGART. 18 acres. The city council propose to give the Government a guarantee that the expropriation by the Government of that particular piece of ground will not cost more than \$400,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) For the 18 acres?

Mr. HAGGART. For the 18 acres.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The statement was made last year that \$400,000 would be required for  $7\frac{1}{2}$  acres.

Mr. HAGGART. The land I speak of covers two blocks between Cornwallis street and the station. The assessed value of the property is \$450,000. A portion of it will be required by the city for the purpose of widening the street, which at present runs up to Halifax station, and which the council intends to pay for themselves. If we expropriated the property ourselves the probabilities are that the amount we would be obliged to pay would be largely in excess of the sum for which the city offers to purchase it. There are two other propositions. One is to acquire the land passing in front of this block and along the end of the docks, until we reach the ordnance property in the centre of the city, and to build a station there. The third plan is the expropriation of the whole of the rear of the dock property to an extent equal to that proposed to be acquired from Cornwallis street to the station. One of the plans proposed is advocated by the board of trade, the first one I mentioned is advocated by the city council; and the expenditure on either of the three plans, so far as my officers can judge, will be about the same. The expenditure for the purpose of securing either of these accommodations proposed will be, including improvements such as grading, laying of tracks and the erection of the necessary buildings for the transaction of business, in the neighbourhood of \$595,000. I may state that the requirements for railway purposes would not extend to the full limits of the property proposed to be expropriated from Cornwallis street to the station, but I am assured by my officers that the property required for station purposes and for extra accommodation might cost us, if the Government went to expropriate about one-fourth of the property from Cornwallis street to the station, as much as we would be called upon to pay under the arrangement which it is possible to make with the city, that is to say, \$400,000. I cannot say that I approve of any plans, or that I am favourable to any one at present; but, judging from the map and from the information I have derived from my officers, I am inclined to the proposition of the city council, that is, to take the property between Cornwallis street and the station. At all events, I am not inclined to make any expropriation or expenditure for the purpose of building this large increased

accommodation and incurring this large expenditure, for it is a large expenditure, taking into consideration the amount already made on terminal facilities at Halifax, without further enquiring into the matter, having a plan fully made and giving the subject more consideration than I have been able to give it at present. There is another item which appears in the Estimates for the purpose of affording terminal facilities at St. John. We took an appropriation last year and purchased a large amount of property for the purpose of affording terminal facilities, the Harris property, at an expenditure of \$200,000. The money voted last year, I think \$80,000, was applied towards that purchase. We are asking, Mr. Chairman, for a sum to supplement that for the purpose of paying for this property. That, also, is a property which my officers say is in excess of the requirements of the road at present, but the arrangements which we have been able to make for the purchase of that property are so favourable that the parties who were valuing the property considered that the land which we would absolutely require for improved facilities at that terminus, would cost us, if we were only to take the portion that we required, very nearly the amount that we have been able by arrangement to get the whole property for. A detailed statement of the valuation of the different arbitrators of the triangle which was absolutely necessary for the requirements of the increased traffic there, and on account of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, will show that the amount which we were required to pay for the small portion needed was nearly equal to the amount which we have been able to get the whole property for. There is another small expenditure for the purpose of continuing the railway along the water front in order to reach some wharves in front of the city, so as to give greater accommodation than we have at present. We have an arrangement with the city council by which we will be required to build no more than the actual track and the laying of the road, as all other expenses are borne, and all other claims for damages are prevented by a guarantee from the city. We ask, for the purpose of completing that track, \$14,000, but the estimated expenditure is in the neighbourhood of \$25,000, and for which we will require a supplementary vote. There is nothing more important that I know of in the Intercolonial Railway estimates; but if something should develop in the course of the debate, I will only be too glad to give the fullest information which any members of the House may require. I promised to make enquiries as to the expenditure on printing and advertising for the Intercolonial Railway, because a statement was made by one of the members of the House that the expenditure for printing, stationery, and advertising on the Intercolonial Railway was far in excess of the expenditure of some of the leading roads of the country which had a great deal more business. I got my officer to enquire from the Grand Trunk Railway with reference to their expenditure in this direction, and to have a comparison made between it and the Intercolonial Railway. I find, instead of the expenditure being eight or ten times the amount on the Intercolonial Railway that it is on the Grand Trunk, that the expenditure is only one-half on the Intercolonial Railway that it is on the Grand Trunk Railway. I will read the figures: