

gate this country to the expenditure of large sums of money for the purchase of small railways in different sections of the country, and when they come to examine the Montreal terminals bill, which will require an expenditure of \$50,000,000, I suggest that they consider at that time the total obligations of the national railways for the next twelve months period.

May I be permitted, not that I want to digress and discuss another resolution, but merely to make this picture complete, to refer to the Montreal terminals? I am not referring to that project with the suggestion that the work in Montreal should not be proceeded with, because I want to postulate this at once: Montreal undoubtedly must have additional terminal facilities at the earliest possible moment, because the present terminals in Montreal are a disgrace to the railways. Let us bear in mind that the Canadian Northern terminals in Montreal represent a capital obligation—for which this country has assumed full responsibility, and will undoubtedly pay—of \$18,000,000; I refer to the Canadian Northern mountain tunnel terminal, which will become part of the main terminal. It is proposed this year to authorize a further expenditure for the Montreal terminals of \$50,000,000. I think any thoughtful member will agree with me when I say that when you enter upon a scheme estimated to cost, say, \$50,000,000, you may reasonably expect that ultimately the project will cost much more than that sum. I think that all who have discussed it agree with that statement. So I suggest that with the \$18,000,000 in the tunnel terminal, with the proposed \$50,000,000, which would make \$68,000,000, we may anticipate the cost of the Montreal terminals to reach the enormous sum of approximately \$80,000,000.

Mr. DUNNING: I am sorry to interrupt my hon. friend. I think he would be well within the mark in making that statement, if he included the cost of the present old Grand Trunk facilities there and the Moreau street property of the old Canadian Northern, which of course were not included in the tunnel scheme. Our total commitment, including the new \$50,000,000, would probably be at least \$80,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS: So we can say between \$80,000,000 and \$100,000,000.

Mr. DUNNING: Including what has already been invested.

Mr. STEVENS: Including what is already there.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not saying that the most favourable consideration should not be given to the problem, but I do say if we are to authorize such an enormous expenditure, then the committee that takes hold of this legislation when it leaves the house should give to it the most careful study and be perfectly sure that the most economical form of development has been adopted. I pause just to say this to the minister and to pass it on to the committee for what it may be worth; for it is a different committee from that which considers Canadian National Railway matters—it is the regular standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. In passing I suggest this might have gone to the other committee.

Mr. DUNNING: I would have preferred that course, but it was not possible.

Mr. STEVENS: The other committee has all the information before it. That is why I am anxious to give expression to these views this afternoon. I do not wish in any way to disparage the standing or reputation of Mr. Palmer. I understand the terminals which have been suggested have been planned by the railway engineers, but that their plans have been modified or changed somewhat by Mr. Palmer and now bear his imprimatur as an expert. Mr. Palmer is, as far as I know, an estuarial engineer, that is, an engineer who has made a specialty of that branch of engineering dealing with difficult streams and currents and so forth—a very, very important branch of engineering—but he is not necessarily a city passenger or freight terminal engineer which is a vastly different thing.

Mr. DUNNING: He is.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister indicates that he is. I cannot put my opinion in opposition to that of the minister.

Mr. DUNNING: If my hon. friend will permit me, it is not a matter of the opinion of either of us, but a matter of fact. I shall be glad to give my hon. friend information in respect to the very large railway schemes on which Mr. Palmer has been engaged. I will discuss that on the Montreal terminals resolution.

Mr. STEVENS: The reason I am reciting it now is to get the whole of the picture together. But I submit very great care should be taken—

Mr. DUNNING: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: —not necessarily to accept Mr. Palmer's dictum as the final word in this matter. We are going to authorize the ex-