

beginning, and the instructions were given to the engineers that we should get that grade and that curve and yet we were told it would cost only \$61,000,000. So we may wipe out the seventeen pages under that head, as we are simply getting the kind of railway we were told we would get for \$61,000,000, and that does not account in any way for the greater amount that this road has cost the country over the estimate. I want to say that at the time this contract was brought before the House, as I said before, the Conservative party did not oppose it, but we did move several amendments. One amendment, for instance, was that the rental of the eastern division should be secured upon the property of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. You will understand that, as the situation is now, if the Grand Trunk Pacific did not pay the rental on the 1,800 miles of the eastern division, we would have no lien whatever on the western division for the payment of that rent, and no lien upon the Grand Trunk railway itself, which is supposed to be behind this thing and which, as Mr. Fielding said, was to be in it and of it and form the whole thing. We moved another resolution that, as the Grand Trunk railway was getting all the benefit from the Grand Trunk Pacific contract, the Grand Trunk Railway Company should therefore assume the obligations. That was voted down. We moved a great number of amendments with the object of bettering the conditions of this contract, which were all voted down, but we never opposed the construction of the railway itself. Now what do we find? Notwithstanding that we were to get the same kind of railway which my hon. friend from South Renfrew says we are getting to-day, for \$61,000,000, it is costing five times that much. That means at 3 per cent a rental of \$5,400,000 a year, or \$14,800 a day, or \$616 an hour. Now let us see in detail what the railway is to cost the country, taking it from a capital point of view, that is the cost of the railway itself to Canada. In the first place we have \$180,000,000. Then we add to that seven years' interest at 4 per cent, which is \$56,857,720. Next we have seven years' interest on the mountain section amounting to \$13,472,099. Then, the implementing of those bonds which cost the country \$10,000,000, that makes \$260,339,819. In the next place we have to pay the difference between 3 per cent and 4 per cent, that is one per cent, on \$180,000,000 for all time to come, and that

capitalized makes \$45,000,000 more. That makes \$305,339,819. I add to that the cost of the Quebec bridge because, notwithstanding what my hon. friend from South Renfrew says, I have come to the conclusion that the Quebec bridge is more useful for transporting trains over the St. Lawrence than the armouries that are being built by the Minister of Militia, and it would not have been built had it not been for the National Transcontinental railway. So I add the cost of the Quebec bridge, \$23,314,099. I do not know whether I should say anything about the Quebec bridge, but I would like to say this. My hon. friend says it should not be included as part of the cost of the National Transcontinental railway. I am free to admit that Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not include it in his estimate of what the road would cost, nor did Mr. Fielding include it, but I think the people of the country will come to the conclusion that it should be included; and in view of the fact that Mr. Fielding included part of the cost of that bridge I think that is another reason why it should be included. My hon. friends on the other side should not be very proud of their record in connection with that bridge, at any rate. In the first place, the contract was given to a local company of political friends, the whole paid-up capital of which was only about \$40,000, to build a bridge estimated to cost \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000. They gave the contract to a company of that kind, who only put \$40,000 into it, one-half of which was paid out in directors' fees attending the meeting. The company, of course, was unable to finance the work and asked the Government to finance the bonds, which it did to the extent of something like \$6,000,000. The Quebec bridge through the fault of some one—I do not say the Government—fell into the river at a time when the Government had guaranteed the bonds of the worthless company, and the Government had to put up \$6,000,000 themselves, for which they have never got a cent to this day. The bridge is lying in the bottom of the river; perhaps I should not say that, because the Government had to pay \$50,000 more to take the scrap iron out of the river. That is the history of the Quebec bridge, except this: that the estimated cost of the Quebec bridge including what has fallen in the river, what we have spent to date, and what will be necessary to complete it, is \$23,000,000, nearly twice as much as Sir Wilfrid Laurier said the whole National Transcontinental railway would cost. Including the Quebec