

thing, and that he is perfectly confident that the road could be built for \$16,000 a mile. That expenditure of \$16,000 a mile amounts to, as near as possible, \$2,000,000 on 115 miles. The \$63,000 a year which is set apart for it is to pay the interest on it, for the Government can borrow money at $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, and in that way it would just pay the interest on \$2,000,000 for the building of this road. Of course, if a company were to undertake to borrow it they would have to pay probably 5 per cent., at the very least, for the money, and therefore, instead of costing \$63,400 a year it would cost \$100,000 a year; and as this road, I imagine, would not have much local traffic on it, for the moment, it is not probable that any company not particularly flush would be disposed to place themselves in a position at once to lose \$37,000 a year on the building of this road; but that contingency does not apply, it appears to me, to the Government, because the revenue afforded by this subsidy will pay the whole interest on the cost, assuming that the report of the engineers with regard to it is correct, or that the offer of the Bridge Company to do it be accepted. Many questions have been asked about the road—for instance, it has been said that it is to get running powers over the Intercolonial Railway, and so on. Well, it has running powers over the Intercolonial Railway for between 9 and 10 miles, from the point where it joins the existing line, at a place called Boundary Creek, to Moneton. It is probably not more than 9 and certainly not more than 10 miles, so that is the entire extent to which running powers will be granted over the Intercolonial Railway. I have stated now to the House what I understand is the project, as plainly, frankly and fairly as I can. I have given the House exactly the information which I have myself obtained, and which I believe to be correct.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—I rise to oppose the motion which has just been made by the hon. leader of the House, and shall ask the Senate to substitute for it one that I intend to offer myself, namely, a motion for the six months' hoist of this Bill. I do not intend, as I did when I originally contemplated making this motion, to go over the history of the Short Line Railway.

The hon. leader of the House has done that so fully that he has relieved me from any necessity whatever of repeating it. Besides, the subject has been so thoroughly discussed, not only in the press, but in another place, that every gentleman who listens to me must be possessed of as much information regarding it as I am myself. I think it will be admitted that the general feeling in both Houses of Parliament, whatever party exigency may have rendered necessary, is that the expenditure contemplated by this Bill is a useless and wasteful application of the public funds. I expect before this discussion is over that there will be little difficulty in the majority coming to that conclusion. As I am relieved from the necessity of entering into the history of the several Bills, and the legislation which have culminated in the present position of this railway, by the very full and accurate statement of the hon. leader of the House, I shall first turn my attention to one argument which was very generally and effectively used in another place in support of this measure—the argument, I believe, which had the greatest influence with a large number of gentlemen—it is that the faith of the country was pledged to this measure. My hon. friend the leader of the House did not explicitly put forward that argument to-day, but it has been advanced by the Government elsewhere, that the faith of the country was pledged to the construction of this railway, and that therefore it was our inevitable duty to pass the Bill before the House. I should like to ask how is the faith of the country pledged to the construction of this road? Had not a subsidy been granted in aid of this line by several Acts of Parliament, a subsidy in all of \$250,000 for a certain number of years for its completion from Montreal to Salisbury? But the granting of a subsidy to a road does not render it imperative on the Government to secure its completion as a Government work if the subsidy is not taken up. If no company can be found to build this road to Salisbury under the terms of the subsidy I do not understand how the duty is imposed on the Government of stepping in and undertaking to construct such a railway as a public work. If the Government had repudiated its obligations under