

113.17. That is exactly the same as I have read out to this committee.

Mr. HAGGART. The estimate was made in 1898, what was it then? The minister is talking of the last years' estimate.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is ancient history. I have now to resume. The branch to Murray Harbour was estimated to cost \$1,031,061.02.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. When was that estimate made?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Is it not a fact that that road was estimated to cost \$8,000 a mile, and now we find it has cost in the vicinity of \$32,000 a mile? The House would like an explanation of the jump of \$24,000 a mile in the cost of a railway in a level country without any grades. The Prince Edward Island Railway was built for \$8,000 or \$10,000 a mile, and we find this railway costing three times as much per mile as the railway built in 1871, though labour is cheaper, material is cheaper, and the mode of construction is cheaper. Besides that, I believe the rails were second-hand rails taken from the Intercolonial.

Mr. EMMERSON. They were just as good rails as are being put down on the Intercolonial to-day, except that they were a lighter rail. They were practically new rails. You do not require 80 pound rails on a narrow gauge railway; but you have just as good rails on that railway as you have anywhere on the Intercolonial, except that they are lighter.

Mr. BARKER. May I ask if these rails that were quite good, were taken off the Intercolonial?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Then you charge the Intercolonial capital account with the whole of the new rails?

Mr. EMMERSON. I might explain here; the total expenditure on the branch and Murray Harbour was \$870,121.91, leaving a balance or difference between the estimated cost and the amount expended, of \$160,931.11. Then for rolling stock, the estimate was \$200,000, and there was expended up to November 30 last, \$145,992.35. That left a balance of \$54,007.65. Then there was an estimate for rails at Murray Harbour in connection with the railway, of \$69,955. No portion of that had been expended, and therefore there was to expend \$69,955. Now in answering the question with respect to the balance to be paid on these works, I said there was still to pay and still unexpended, \$561,253.93. That total is reached by adding to the \$276,352.17, the balance on the Hillsboro' River Bridge, \$160,939.11 the balance on the branch to Murray Harbour, \$54,007.65, and the balance on the

rolling stock, \$69,955, for rails at Murray Harbour. Those several amounts make the total sum of \$561,253.95, which is in accordance with the answer which I gave to the hon. gentleman on the floor of the House.

Mr. A. MARTIN. What would be the total for the road now?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total for the road, including rolling stock and crib-work at Murray Harbour, would be \$1,301,016.02, plus the balance that is to be paid, according to the statement which I read to my hon. friend a moment ago.

Mr. HAGGART. My statement is that the bridge was only to cost about \$750,000, and the road about one-third of the present estimate.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the hon. gentleman has mixed up the superstructure and the substructure.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Bole.

DEATH OF MR. E. F. CLARKE, M.P.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, it becomes my very sad and painful duty to announce what is already known, I think, to a great many members of the House, the very sudden and lamented death of our friend Mr. E. F. Clarke, member for Centre Toronto. I understand that an opportunity will be given on Monday to make fitting reference to this very sad event. I rise at the present time to suggest that as a tribute of respect to the memory of the late Mr. Clarke, we should adjourn now and not proceed further with the business of the day. I am sure that all of us on both sides of the House will feel that we should pay this tribute to the memory of our late confrère.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). The House has heard with profound regret the sad information conveyed by the leader of the opposition, of the death of our late colleague, Mr. E. F. Clarke. I am sure that the Prime Minister will share with the leader of the opposition, as we all do, in the deepest sorrow at this unexpected visit of the angel of death. It is becoming that we should act on the suggestion of the leader of the opposition. I