called, but he was unable to get on it and had to drive the 20 miles. Just as he got there the patient was dead, and I am told that the chances were that had he gone on a train which would bring him in 20 or 30 minutes he could have saved the life of the patient. That may not be, but that was his opinion, and I think, therefore, that doctors and clergymen should be allowed to travel on these special freights. The people in the northern counties of New Brunswick have less railway accommodation than have the people in any other part of the Dominion. In most places where trains are running two or three times a day, persons can go backwards and forwards during the day, but in Campbellton and in the County of Restigouche under the present arrangement they can only travel, I may say, once a day. If they go by the express which stops at Campbellton and runs each way once a day, and if they want to go a distance of 40 miles, they have to go to Bathurst and come by another train. If they come from Bathurst to Jacquet River, which is a distance of 20 miles, they have to go to Campbellton, because this express train will not let them off at their regular station. I think the present arrangement is very inconvenient, and I would ask the Minister of Railways to reconsider the matter with a view to having the train service restored to what it was before this reduction was made.

The hon. member for North Mr. MULOCK. Wellington (Mr. McMullen) gave a great many interesting statistics which I thought would have called for some comment if not reply from the hon. Minister of Railways, and I think the item should not be passed until he has addressed the committee on the points raised.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that the statement I gave in reference to printing I have verified since, and I find that my figures in reference to the cost of stationery and printing of the Grand Trunk Railway were strictly accurate. This is my authority for the statement:

"MONTREAL, 9th May, 1892.

"Collingwood Schreiber, Esq., Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to your telegram received to-day, it is not customary to make a division of expenses into stationery, advertising, and printing respectively: but I have a statement for the whole year from which I quote for your information as desired: stationery and printing, \$127,817.47; advertising, \$18,438.57; total, \$146,256.04. This will be found to compare accurately with the printed reports for the two half-years, allowing for the fact that some items are included under expenses of agencies, &c., &c. &c.

"Yours truly,

"L. G. SEARGEANT,

"General Manager,"

In reply to the statement of the hon. gentleman in reference to the cost per mile of running trains on the Intercolonial Railway, I may be permitted, though it will take a little time, to give some statements in reference to the earnings and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway as compared with other railways in Canada. I have a statement from 1876-77 down to 1890-91 which it may not, perhaps, sufficiently interest the House for me to read in full, as the details may be found printed in the Public Accounts. The total loss is \$4,120,550.99. The profit during the same period was \$29,763.83, making a net loss of \$4,090,-Mr. McALISTER.

and working expenses per mile of the railway for the year 1890-91. We had 1,094 miles of railway in operation; the earnings per mile were \$2,721.55; the working expenses per mile were \$3,576.50, a loss per mile of \$855.05. Now, the proper test of the economic running of a railway is the expenditure per train mile. In 1890-91 the earnings per train mile were 59.21 cents, and the working expenses 72.84 cents, or a loss of 13.63 cents per train mile.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon, gentleman give the committee the earnings per train mile on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. I will give a comparison with a dozen railways on the continent. The earnings of the Intercolonial Railway from passengers, freight and mails in 1890-91 were as follows:-

Passengers	1.854.629 88
Total	2,977,395 38

The expenses for locomotive power, car expenses, station expenses and general expenses, maintenance and car mileage for 1891 were as follows :-

Locomotive power	\$	1,281,800 32
Car expenses		
Station expenses		396,320 22
General charges		197,006 56
Maintenance of way and wor		955,293 68
Engine mileage	6,08	0,791 miles.
Train mileage	-5.02	7.791 "

Car mileage.....

56,492,801

What the hon, gentleman wants is a comparison between the cost per mile of the running of trains on the Intercolonial Railway with the cost on the other railways in Canada of over 100 miles in length. I will give a table showing the cost of operation and maintenance of the various railways in Canada for the year ending the 30th of June, 1891 :--

_	Milengo.	Train mileage.	Working expenses.	Cost per ton per mile.
Prince Edward Island Ry. Canadian Pacific Railway Central Ontario	379 1094 210 5537	5,027,791 265,6 6 6 13,754,014 110,000	64,396 3,178,036 3,662,341 257,990 11,538,133	97.65 72.84 97.11 83.89 83.26

Then there is the Manitoba and South-Western, run at a cost of \$1.40 per train mile; then there is the Northern Pacific, 86 cents per train mile; the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake, 77 cents per train mile; the Quebec and Lake St. John, 72 cents per train mile, the same as the Intercolonial Railway; the Quebec Central, 67 cents; the South-Eastern, 91 cents; and the Windsor and Annapolis, 93 cents per train mile. I will give a table of the earnings per train mile for the year ending 30th of June, 1891, which will show how very cheaply we carry material over the Intercolonial Railway. The Alberta Coal Company, with 174 miles of road in 787.16. I will give a statement of the earnings operation, and a train mileage of 284,265, earns