

and report, before incurring the expense of a thorough professional survey.

Bear in mind that I am not at present arguing the question of "cheap railways," or the narrow gauge, as opposed to the system already in operation in Canada. That is a question nearly altogether irrelevant to the question of route ; although I do notice, nevertheless, that the Central men seem to be endeavoring to mix the two together in the public mind. It does appear to me as if they were trying to get the public to take the words "cheapness and economy," not alone in connection with the system of narrow gauge, light rails, cars and engines, and low rates of speed—where the words do apply, but also in connection with their favorite line of location of the road, where the words do not apply at all. What they aim at is to throw the color of "cheap" from one thing over to the other, by confusing the two together. But, let these two questions be discussed separately, each on its own merits. If a cheap narrow gauge railway is the thing for you—which I very much doubt, after all—it can be laid down on one line as well as another. Only, it would not answer except on an independent line, reaching a desirable terminus without connecting with any of the existing broad gauge lines. I think, however, as above indicated, that I can detect one reason why the Central men are in such ecstasies over the cheap railway system. A 3 ft. 6 in. gauge, with light rails, must of course cost a good deal less, wherever laid down, than a 5 ft. 6 in. gauge with heavy rails. My suspicion is that the Toronto Central route people, having an inkling in their own minds of the enormous engineering difficulties and consequent high cost incident to their line, are driven to take up the cheap system of construction as the most feasible means of lessening the figures which they have to present to the public. Of course there may be such a thing as a *cheap*