

the question of the operating expenses of the road, and there I shall be able to say that the efforts which have been made to practice the most stringent economy in connection with this work, have been eminently successful. The working expenses for 1877-78, for the 714 miles, were \$1,811,273.56; the working expenses for 1878-79 were \$2,010,183.22, or an increase of \$198,909.66 for the year ending 30th June, 1879, over the year ending 30th June, 1878. That would be a startling exhibit if it could not be satisfactorily accounted for. I think it can be. I am throwing no blame upon my hon. predecessor in connection with the large increase during the year 1878-79. I merely drew attention to the fact, and I will show the House that the causes which mainly led to that increase, and for which I was not responsible, were owing to the management of the late Government, who were responsible for them. This increase in the cost of working the Railway was chiefly for work commenced in the early part of the year, namely:—

Mr. ANGLIN: What is the object of giving these figures?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I am showing what largely contributes to the excess of expenditure of 1878-79 over that of the previous year. The figures are: additional ballasting, \$2,841; additional sidings, \$9,949; additional buildings, \$27,614; renewals, repairs to bridges, culverts, etc., \$38,195; renewals on turn-tables, \$4,078; improved water supply, \$18,808; renewal of sleepers, \$18,381; gas and water at Moncton, \$11,504;—making in all \$131,372. These works were necessary to put the road in a proper and efficient condition, with the exception of the cost of the gas and water service at Moncton, which could have been dispensed with. There was no necessity for that; it was no doubt adopted by the late Government under the impression, and with the belief, that it was in the interest of the service in that connection. I hold the late Government responsible for the increased expenditure over the previous year. There is a very considerable expenditure that I was obliged to incur in consequence of the change of the law during the last Session. It will be remembered that there was an Act introduced

which provided for the raising of overhead bridges, so as to prevent persons—brakesmen, conductors, and others—going on the top of cars, from being killed or injured by coming in contact with such bridges in passing under them. The Act originally provided only for the raising of such structures as were in a dilapidated condition, or in a bad state of repair; but it was amended in the Senate so as to absolutely require that all structures, whether requiring repairs or not, should be changed as indicated. We were, therefore, as my hon. predecessor knows, obliged to raise these overhead bridges at a considerable cost. These overhead bridges and the snowsheds also contributed towards this over-expenditure, involved in complying with that Act, for which I am not holding the late Government responsible. The rest of the expenditure incurred as stated—the locomotive and car expenses, \$58,180—in excess of the previous year, was mainly due to the wages of a large number of workmen, previously charged to Capital Account, being charged to ordinary working expenses. The investigation, as I have stated, into the whole of this matter, led me to the conclusion that it would be possible, without impairing the efficiency of the road, to introduce reforms and economies that would bring about a more satisfactory state of things in reference to the great excess of expenditure over income; and in pursuance of that conclusion, I endeavoured to obtain the best information I could, as to how far that idea could be carried out, so as, while properly preserving and keeping unimpaired the permanent way and rolling-stock, to accomplish a large reduction in the expenditure. I need not ask the House to imagine a more unpleasant duty than setting about the reduction of expenditure. It is a very easy matter to appoint parties to office, and pay them liberal salaries, and it is extremely popular thus to dispense the public money in a manner agreeable to the recipients, but I know how very different is the duty of dispensing with public officers, many of them deserving men, discharging faithfully the duties of their office, and I know how very different is the duty of reducing the salaries of other such men remaining in the service. Still I felt bound, in the interest of the country, to ascertain