

unmistakable hostility to the interests of the Maritime Provinces. The member for South Oxford showed particular hostility to the Intercolonial Railway as well as to those works which chiefly concern us in the Maritime Provinces, namely, the Short Line Railway, subsidies to railway, subsidies to Provinces, and the assumption of provincial debts. Those have been burning questions with us in the Maritime Provinces, and both his friends and his foes in politics in those Provinces have been advocating them from Confederation up to the present time and they have been making oftentimes ingenious claims that their legitimate demands had not been satisfied. They find to day that the second in command of this ship on the Opposition side is their bitterest foe, that he is opposed to the benefits which they derive at the hands of the Conservative party, and that if he got into power he would drive them to his favorite system of direct taxation which he lauded so much, by cutting away their means of government. He went on to attack the Intercolonial Railway, and he laid down a principle by which I shall judge his own Government when he was in power. He stated that there was a loss in working that railway, and that this proved that it was run and built for political purposes. Does that follow as a necessary consequence, or is that one of the fanciful calculations of the ex-Minister of Finance. If it is a true test, then what must have been the political rascality of that hon. gentleman's Government, because the figures show that in the operation of that road, he, himself, is on record as stating that that railway would be run at a loss of, perhaps, \$600,000 annually. The figures show that the loss of operating that line was far greater under the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member than it is under the Government of the present day. The facts and figures established more than that: they established that while we are hauling more than twice the traffic, while the system has been more enlarged, not only the losses on this road, but those on the canals, which the hon. gentlemen did not attack, have been a benefit to the merchants and people of Ontario and Quebec, as well as to the people of the Maritime Provinces; and members from the Maritimes Provinces, both Liberal and Conservative, will join in resisting the attack on our vital interests now made and threatened by the hon. member for South Oxford. The facts are that, in 1878, Government railways, including the Prince Edward Island Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway, consisted of 913 miles, whereas in 1888, they consisted of 1,185 miles. The facts show that the traffic carried in 1878, was 561,633 tons, while in 1888, owing to the expansion of our internal trade, as pointed out by the Finance Minister, it amounted to 1,348,426 tons. Now, I ask the House again to note that the principle enunciated by the hon. gentleman is that when there is a loss on working that road, it is due to political corruption. In 1878 the loss on working the smaller system and carrying a much smaller quantity of traffic, was \$716,083, whereas in 1887-88 the loss was only half, being \$363,043. The hon. gentleman has unwittingly given me an opportunity to testify to the marked success in the management of that road and the economy practised under the present Administration, as contrasted with its management under the Administration of which the hon. gentleman was a member. But one word on behalf of that road. I have said that it was of importance to the Maritime Provinces; but it is important to the Dominion of Canada as a whole. That railway, which the hon. member for South Oxford himself stated—and I could give him the speech, if he desired proof of the statement—would involve a loss of \$600,000 a year to operate it, was one of the bonds of the Union, was one of those features of the Union which he himself advocated in 1865—a road with regard to which George Brown said he would give five Intercolonial Railways for the sake of Confederation; and he was a friend of Confederation, no matter on which side of the House he sat,

and to his dying day, I believe, never enunciated the principles which his former friends are enunciating now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How much was charged to capital account on the Intercolonial Railway in 1888?

Mr. TUPPER. We will go into the details later on. But at present I will tell the hon. gentleman that that subject was threshed out in this House last Session, and the discussion can be found in *Hansard*. Hon. gentlemen never have anything new; they tell the same old story to the House, and with the same success. Now, I wish to point out to the House the importance of that road. Along its route, where forests once stood, you find to-day thriving towns and villages, in which great manufacturing industries are springing up. In Springhill, in the county of Cumberland, there are 7,000 people where there were only two or three hundred a few years ago. The people engaged in the industry of coal mining not only pay enormous sums into the public revenue in the shape of duty, but, by sending their coal over the Intercolonial Railway, to the western Provinces, enable the Government to keep the other freights up to their present figures. These bodies of consumers, in turn, buy from the people of western Canada; and thus they benefit, not merely the locality in which they operate, but contribute to the public coffers, and promote the business interests of the people of this country; and he would be a bold man who would attempt to stop that road and carry on Confederation. But I do not think these hon. gentlemen are much in love with Confederation to-day. We find the hon. member violently attacking the Short Line Railway system. What is his position? He found himself in a miserable minority when he attacked it in this House at its inception. He found his whole party deserting him. He found members from the Maritime Provinces, on one side and on the other side, standing up and claiming that railway as a right; and the majority of the people of this country, represented as well by the members from the Province of Ontario, supported us in our claim to the extension of our great continental system to our Maritime Province ports. We found the votes in this House against him such as 39 to 107, 36 to 101 and 35 to 101; and yet he goes back to his enmity towards the Maritime Provinces who have supported this Government since Confederation, and continue to support it. The Chamber of Commerce of the city of Halifax has just passed a resolution demanding the extension of that line to that city. Are they dupes? Are they men who have been purchased? Will the hon. gentleman hurl his anathemas against them as men who are urging expenditures from corrupt motives? The hon. gentleman attacked railway subsidies, and yet he knows that the business men of this country, irrespective of politics, have urged the granting these subsidies. He knows, moreover, that every railway which has been subsidised by this Parliament has been subsidised on the ground that for the small expenditure involved, if you could secure the introduction of sufficient capital for the construction and working of the railway, this country would be recouped a hundred and a thousand times over by the business that would be promoted and the settlements that would spring up as results of that policy. That is a policy eminently popular and successful; and when the hon. gentleman says such expenditures are used for corrupt purposes, he knows more of his friends than of his enemies, and he must be speaking of his friends in Ontario and his friends in Nova Scotia, who are now for a short time in power. Now, I must go on to notice a very important feature in connection with this debate. The hon. Minister of Finance took a strong position on the justifiability of what he called our national debt, the net debt of this country, and he was able to show that we had more than enough public works, and useful public works, to justify the expenditure of every dollar that went into those works.