

misrepresentation—unintentional I presume of course—that I find in this report. Mr. Schreiber gives the unsurveyed portion of the line from the point of junction near Harvey, New Brunswick to Moncton, as being 119 miles, that is, on the Northern line, number 9. On the line which he selects, No. 6, he gives the portion not surveyed, 113 miles. The portion not surveyed on No. 6 ought to be longer than the portion unsurveyed on the other. I am not going to show that now, but such is the case. The truth is, adopting the southern line to the end of the International, it is really shorter to go round the north of Moosehead and Chesuncook Lakes, to Halifax, and the same distance to St. John, as by the route which the engineer has recommended.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I was in hopes that the hon. gentleman who has introduced this matter would have taken the suggestion of the leader of the House and deferred his remarks until such time as the question of a Short Line Railway came up in a more direct manner, and probably then they would have afforded more interest to members, and it would have opened up a wider discussion than it has, owing to the time and manner in which it has been introduced. I do not complain of my hon. friend's criticism: it is essential, I think, that there should be a full criticism of this matter in view of the interests and money involved, that no false step should be taken. What my hon. friend has said is true: that we have the chief engineer of railways reporting in favor of a certain line which the acting Minister of Railways has, no doubt, some interest in, and which the Canadian Pacific Railway would be inclined to favor. Therefore, there is greater reason why this House and Parliament should more carefully watch the proposition and action of the Government in regard to the line which it is proposed to establish. I do not exactly agree with my hon. friend in much that he has said. I do not think he has decided himself where this line ought to go whether by the North Shore and cross near Quebec, or via Richmond to Canterbury. When this matter came up before, under an array of figures from my hon. friend I opposed his views, I said that any line

crossing the river at Montreal and going in an easterly direction even without any inclination south, must be to a large extent a feeder to the Railway system of the United States, and my hon. friend had the audacity—if I may be permitted to say so—to tell me in effect that I did not know what I was talking about. It seems now that I converted him, that he has changed his mind and his views are in consonance with what I then said. My hon. friend is in favor of a line to Quebec and from there by the Chaudiere down to Canterbury, or by the road from Richmond across to Canterbury.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the route by Richmond is the shortest and best, but if we cannot get that I think the other should be had, the Combination line.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Exactly, so my hon. friend is coming to my views in entering into the combination line with me now, to avoid if possible getting entangled with the railway system of the United States. He says it does not matter who builds or owns this Short line railway. Our people in the Maritime Provinces are inclined, I think, as far as possible, to have the Canadian railways, freed from any foreign system of railways to maintain them against foreign rivals. We are inclined to regard the Canadian Pacific Railway as the national highway of the Dominion, and wish it extended to the extreme end of Nova Scotia. To facilitate trade between the Maritime Provinces and the west, it is believed that we should have a continuous line in the hands of one company. The road being in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway they will have an interest in carrying the trade upon their line as far as possible, and conveying it to ports in the Maritime Provinces, making them the winter ports for the grain of our North-West. So when my hon. friend says it is immaterial what line of railway this connects with I think he is neither advocating the interests of Canada as a whole, nor of the Maritime Provinces, nor what the people of those provinces conceive to be their interests when asked to pay \$250,000 a year for 20 years. My hon. friend says there is no objection to some delay.