

just as good a patchwork system as the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Dominion Atlantic Railway and dozens of American lines which can be named.

Then, the next proposal I made was to obtain proper grades between Lake Superior and Winnipeg. There is nothing of a patchwork nature in that, so far as I am aware. There is a proposal to aid the Grand Trunk Pacific to build in the west. Is there anything of a patchwork nature in that? If so, it characterizes the government scheme just as much as mine. Is there anything of a patchwork nature in the proposal that two railways should use in common a line from Edmonton to the coast, if it is sufficient for the purposes of both? If so, exactly the same argument could be applied to dozens of railways on the North American continent. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), the expert of the government, pointed out to us the other day that the Wabash enjoyed running powers over the Grand Trunk. Is that a patchwork system? Is it a patchwork system to have grain brought by the Canadian Pacific Railway from western points to Fort William, thence by steamer to Georgian Bay ports, and thence by three different railway routes to Montreal, and by the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax and St. John? Let me point out to my right hon. friend that if that is a patchwork system, it is the very patchwork system which was endorsed by his late Minister of Railways, when the Intercolonial Railway was extended from Lévis to Montreal. The scheme contemplated then was, that the Grand Trunk should get traffic on the shores of the Georgian bay from the great west, bring it to Montreal, hand it over to the Intercolonial Railway, and that the Intercolonial Railway should transmit it to the maritime ports. Is my scheme a patchwork scheme? What then is the nature of the scheme which was then introduced to this House by the very government of which my right hon. friend is the First Minister, and in which the Postmaster General is a minister; a scheme which was heralded at the time as the very acme of wisdom and of statesmanship so far as railway development is concerned. Moreover, what does the government policy contemplate? It contemplates a line owned and operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific from the coast to Winnipeg; a line owned by the government and operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Moncton and with running powers over the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax or St. John—or, what is much more likely, the transmission of that traffic by the Grand Trunk Railway to Portland. I do not suppose that the Prime Minister or the Postmaster General would regard that as a patchwork scheme, but nevertheless it is quite as deserving of the appellation as the proposal which I made to the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, coming down to a real comparison between the cost of these two schemes, let us see what they actually involve. I would suppose that for the purposes of this comparison I would be entitled to place upon the line from Moncton to Quebec and upon the line from Quebec to Winnipeg at least the same estimate of cost that has been placed by the Postmaster General upon the line which I suggested from Scotia Junction to Sudbury. I know of no reason why a line, not with the grades suggested by the government, but even with fair grades, can be built from Moncton to Winnipeg at less cost than a line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury. I have not heard one word in this House to convince me that a line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury would cost one dollar more per mile than the line from Moncton to Winnipeg. On the contrary, from what I have heard in this House during this discussion, I think it may be safely assumed that, with the same grades and the same general character, the line from Moncton to Winnipeg would cost considerably more per mile than a line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury. However, I will give the Postmaster General the benefit of the doubt, and will place on the proposal of the government the same estimate of cost that he has placed on my proposal of a line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury, that is \$40,000 per mile. On that basis, the line from Moncton to Quebec—400 miles in length at the lowest estimate, though I believe it will be much more than that—will cost \$16,000,000. The length of the line from Quebec to Winnipeg has been variously estimated; but I take the estimate of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance 1,475 miles, which, at \$40,000 per mile, will cost \$59,000,000. The cost of the Quebec bridge, I put at the estimate of the Minister of Finance, \$2,000,000. For interest during the period of construction, I adopt the basis of the Minister of Finance, although the figures are of course larger, because the cost is larger; I put that at \$4,838,250. This makes a total so far of \$81,831,250. The interest on the eastern division for seven years, during which no rental is to be paid, will amount to \$17,176,033; and the interest on the eastern division for three years, during which rental may not be paid, or if not paid will be added to capital, will amount to \$7,365,442. So that you have, as the cost of this railway, on what I believe to be a low and moderate estimate, no less a sum than \$106,389,725. I have not included in this a dollar for interest on the rentals of the eastern division; I have simply taken the rental which is not to be paid, and computed it for seven years. I might have made some additions to this estimate, but I leave it as it is, excluding all doubtful items and all items on which there might be controversy; and I take as my basis exactly what my hon. friend the Postmaster General estimated as the cost of my proposed line from