

more bad than good. If there are large forests of pulp wood, they will be very valuable, and, if there is a great deal of pine, as the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) says, I can understand that the lumbermen of that country would be anxious to get the road built, as it would give them opportunities to extend their operations and increase their holdings. But I would ask the Prime Minister to go further than the editor of the 'News' asks him to go. I would advise him to abandon this part of the line from Moncton to Winnipeg, and to adopt in toto the policy of the leader of the opposition. The government can do it, because they have already adopted the policy of the Conservative party on many occasions and called it theirs, and they can do the same thing now. I think if they adopt the policy of the leader of the opposition it will be much more in the interest of this country.

Another reason why I cannot endorse the government's policy is because it involves so large an expenditure of the people's money, that is entirely uncalled for and useless. Let us compare the two policies as to cost, and for that purpose I will use the figures presented to this House by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), a gentleman in whom I have great confidence because of his ability, his moderation and fairness, and because of the close application he gives to these subjects. His computation is based on the figures given by the Finance Minister as to the distance between Moncton and Winnipeg being 1,875 miles. He puts the construction cost at \$41,500 per mile, making \$77,812,000. He puts the interest during construction at \$3,309,000; cost of the Quebec bridge, \$2,000,000; making a total of \$83,121,000 chargeable to capital account. Then he adds to that simple interest for the first ten years, \$29,238,000; making a total cost to this country of this railway to Winnipeg \$112,359,000. Now, compare these figures with the estimated cost of the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition:

Montreal to Coteau Junction, 30 miles	
at \$40,000 a mile.. . . .	\$ 1,200,000
Coteau Junction to Depot Harbour,	
342 miles, with equipment.. . . .	12,000,000
Scotia Junction to Sudbury, 104 miles	
at \$40,000.. . . .	4,160,000
Interest on construction.. . . .	200,000

Sudbury to Fort William, 555 miles..	25,000,000
Betterments.. . . .	3,000,000
Fort William to Winnipeg, 426 miles	
at \$30,000.. . . .	12,780,000
Betterments.. . . .	2,100,000

Total.. . . . \$60,440,000

It will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that the scheme of the leader of the opposition costs less by \$51,819,000, a saving of that much to the people of this country. Is it not worth saving? Or has this government money to burn? If the money is spent, let it be spent on what are at least useful and profitable undertakings. Now, the member for Bothwell, in his figures, charged \$41,500 per mile for construction. But if the road is to be such a road as the member for North Norfolk intends to construct, it will cost much more, for he intends to have an ideal road. Let us see what the member for North Norfolk said:

As I said last night, this road from Winnipeg to Quebec, if it is to serve the purpose which it is intended to serve, must be a first class road. It must have not more than half per cent grades, and should have four-tenths per cent grades coming east, or twenty-one feet to the mile. It should be laid with 90-pound rails, should have bridges that would carry the heaviest rolling stock in use, with a margin to allow for an increase in the weight of rolling stock; it should have engines of 100 tons weight without the tender, and cars of 50 tons capacity of cargo. The road must be built with a carrying capacity 50 per cent greater than is now required, with a corresponding increase in weight of the engines. And with a road of that kind, considering prospective improvements in railway materials, I feel hopeful that the route will be able to compete with the water route.

Evidently he wants an ideal road, a road that, in the first place, I do not believe can be built in that country and if built, it cannot be built for less than \$60,000 a mile. Let us see what other roads have cost. The Intercolonial cost \$53,000 a mile, the Canadian Pacific Railway cost \$52,000 a mile, the Canada Atlantic Railway \$50,000 a mile, and the Grand Trunk Railway \$106,000 a mile. I believe the new road will cost at least \$50,000 a mile, and as the distance is 1,875 miles, the cost will be \$93,750,000 for construction purposes alone.

Now, Sir, I oppose this scheme because the leader of the opposition has placed a better scheme before the House and the country. The scheme of the leader of the opposition is one that will solve the transportation problem as completely as it can be