you going to end the Grand Trunk Pacific at Quebec or do you intend to build a bridge to Point Lévis to connect with the Lévis section ? There is not a doubt that the government will be compelled to build that bridge, either as a separate undertaking or as a part of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

The hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) did not care two cents whether the amount of money was expended on the Quebec bridge under one name or under the other, what he was directing to the attention of the country was the enormous expenditure for the purpose of accomplishing what the government wished in the building of the Transcontinental Railway. My friend's estimate of $9,000,000 to complete the bridge has not been assailed or questioned. It may be too much, I do not know whether it is or not, but I do know that already $5,900,000 have been expended on it and I should judge that as the government had authority in their hands to investigate it and must have had information on the subject as to the probable cost of the new bridge, they know my hon. friend's estimate of $9,000,000 is correct. The $11,196,290, as my friend puts it, is only a hypothetical amount at the moment and the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance so treat it. But what are the probabilities ? After seven years running of that road from Winnipeg to Moncton across the Quebec bridge, if the bridge is built by a company, what amount of money will the Grand Trunk Pacific probably have to pay for the use of that bridge by the Transcontinental ? The probabilities, judging from railway construction in portions of Canada more favourably situated, are that the government and the country for twenty years afterwards, and the Grand Trunk Pacific, if they are in a position to pay it, will be paying more for the running of the road than they get in receipts. It would be a fair estimate to add the three years' interest but my friend says : No, take it off. Fancy the argument of the Minister of Finance in reference to the terminals at Moncton ! The $750,000 is to be spent there but by some jugglery we are to have the shops built by the country and it was not to be a charge to the country or a charge against the Grand Trunk Pacific. Perhaps it is a charge against the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It certainly is. That is where it is being charged.

Mr. HAGGART. You make an expenditure of $750,000 more than is needed on the Intercolonial Railway owing to the possibility of the Grand Trunk Pacific reaching Moncton and the National Transcontinental is not to pay for it. It does not matter two pins who has to pay for it, the country has to pay the $750,000 and if it was not for the Grand Trunk Pacific reaching Moncton we would not have to spend the money.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is wrong. He will see that enlarging certain buildings is not nearly as costly as building them from the beginning and we did need shops at Moncton. The only difference is that we might not have built them so large.

Mr. HAGGART. I was taking the hon. gentleman's own estimate. But in answer to my hon. friend's question the minister sends down information that the government are spending $750,000 more at Moncton on account of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say that. I said it was fair to charge the Grand Trunk Pacific $750,000 for their share, but we are not spending that much more on their account.

Mr. LENNOX. Then it is not fair to charge them that much.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it is.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is the statement from the memorandum.

> For the terminals at Moncton the sum of $97,000 was included in the bulk for a terminal yard.

Then it is added to the cost of construction of the road.

> With regard to shop accommodation, it is assumed that an arrangement will be made for the joint use of the shops of the Intercolonial Railway. If so, the National Transcontinental Railway's share of the capital expenditure on them is estimated at $750,000 or, at 4 per cent interest, $50,000 a year.

The government estimated the cost of this road at from $25,000 to $28,000 a mile, but they subsequently found that it was going to cost $63,000 a mile. I venture to say that with the terminals and all the other things to be added it cannot be built for much less than $70,000 per mile. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that the excessive cost was caused by the adoption of modern gradients and curvatures and he makes the bold statement that large expenditures are being made on the Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian Northern Railway and Grand Trunk Railway for the purpose of bringing them up-to-date. That is perfectly true, but he also says that roads being built in the same section of the country which is being traversed by the Grand Trunk Pacific are being built upon that principle, that it is better and cheaper, to build the road with four-tenths per cent grades one way and six-tenths per cent grades the other way. The experience of railway men is to the contrary. Every railway man in the country, especially those connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canadian Northern, laughs at the absurdity of building a first class road from Winnipeg to Quebec in the first instance with the gradients and curvatures mentioned by the Minister of