

Railway, as shown by the returns from that road; "but," he said, "that is simply stating the fact that the Intercolonial Railway has shared in the general prosperity of the country." I rejoice to believe that it has, and let us see in this respect if the Government has not added something, done something towards taking advantage of that prosperity, making the most of it, and whether it is not entitled to some credit for what it has done in that direction. The hon. gentleman will not surely say that the expense of management of the Intercolonial Railway is part of the results of the general prosperity of the country, and if there has been a diminution of the actual expenses of management that, certainly, is not to be laid to the credit of the general prosperity of the country. That surely is a point for which the Government may take credit, and upon which we may pride ourselves, and in that respect we are not "flies upon the wheel," which the hon. gentleman speaks of, a term which was used originally, I believe, to describe, in their later years, the course taken by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. Now, the returns for the Intercolonial Railway show very clearly that the expenses of management diminished very much under the present Government, and from the time that we took office there has been increased prosperity, and we did our part towards taking advantage of it. I will take the expense of management on the Intercolonial Railway from the time it began to operate over 714 miles, and will just read them to the House, from which it will be seen that from the date we took possession of this property and had control of it, the expenses of management were very much diminished. The gross losses on the operation of the road (I will omit the hundreds) were as follows, viz:—

In 1876	\$507,000
1877	432,000
1878-9	716,000

while in 1879-80, the first year during which this Government had the complete management of the road, during the whole year, the loss was reduced to \$97,131, so that as between the two last years there was no less a gain than \$542,000. The next year, 1880-81, the figures stand at

\$9,605 profit, while for the last year, 1881-82, the amount is \$10,547. So that the hon. gentleman can hardly deny to the Government credit for good management in this direction. I have also a statement shewing the working expenses per mile of road per year; they are, for the same years,—90 cts, 83 cts, 95 cts, 63 cts, 62 cts, 64 cts, and 65 cts.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Some of the items may be charged to capital account one year, and to running expenses another year; that is one way in which I can understand it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman is ingenious in making that suggestion, but I apprehend it is an unfair one, because the accounts have been kept in the same Department and by the same persons, and so are probably made out upon the same rule. The working expenses are given in the way that I have mentioned, per mile for train run, so there is not much room for error.

HON. MR. SCOTT—And run by the same officers, I suppose?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, but by a much diminished staff, and at diminished expense. The stock and road has nevertheless not been allowed to run down, but on the contrary the property is as good to-day as it ever was; in fact I am told it has improved, and that the track, locomotives, passenger cars, and all the paraphernalia that go to make up material for running the road, are quite as good now as they were at any time during the three years that the hon. gentleman was in office.

HON. MR. POWER—If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I think I can explain that—

HON. MR. ALMON—Order, order.

HON. MR. POWER—I did not ask my hon. colleague if he would allow me to explain,—I asked the leader of the Government—

HON. MR. ALMON—The hon. member for Halifax has already spoken very