

Railways and Canals. The principle they adopt on other roads is to get their road through the country first with moderate grades and curvatures and then, when they have developed the traffic, bring the road up to a higher standard. That is what was contemplated by the original Grand Trunk Pacific agreement. There is no necessity for building a road with gradients of four-tenths of one per cent and a maximum curvature of four degrees under the contract made with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The road between Montreal and Toronto cannot be compared with that standard as to grades and curvatures. All we were bound to do at best was to build a road equal to the road between Montreal and Toronto. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in view of the difficulties of operating the road with the gradients and curvatures between Montreal and Toronto, are at present contemplating abandoning the road over Scarborough Heights and going along the lake shore. The contract allows the Grand Trunk Pacific to have gradients of at least 90 feet to the mile. At the time that the proposition was made for the building of the road I stated my opinion of the country through which it will pass from Winnipeg to Quebec, I stated that the cost of the road would, at the minimum, be \$50,000 per mile, and I stated also that the expenditure on the Quebec bridge would be in excess of the amount that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) stated it would cost the country. I hardly believed, and I can hardly believe up to the present time, that the government will abandon the building of the road from Quebec to Moncton. I pointed to surveys made by Sir Sandford Fleming and I pointed out that it was impossible to get a better road than they have at the present time to Moncton taking into consideration distance, gradients and expenditure. I was told by the premier that there would be a saving in distance between Lévis and Moncton of from 100 to 130 miles. They have let contracts, but is the proposed route one mile shorter between Lévis and Moncton than that which they have at the present time?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) whether the policy of the opposition to-day is that this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway should not be built, or, if not built in its entirety, whether some portion of it should not be built?

Mr. HAGGART. I have no authority to speak for the opposition or to state what their policy is.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. What do you say?

Mr. HAGGART. I was a supporter of the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Lake Superior and to the Pa-

Mr. HAGGART.

cific. I stated that the proposed expenditure from Winnipeg to Quebec was a useless one. I stated also, that of all the monstrous, extravagant, useless expenditures that were ever made by the government of this country, the building of a road from Quebec to Moncton must be given the first place—paralleling your own Intercolonial Railway, making worse an asset which is useless to the people and to be supplemented, as the Minister of Railways and Canals states, by the double tracking of the line from Moncton to Halifax, or, if that is not practicable on account of the gradients, the construction of a shorter cut across to Halifax.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. HAGGART. Of all the extravagant statements made by the Minister of Railways and Canals that is the most extravagant one. Surely he does not contemplate anything of the kind.

Mr. CONMEE. Does the hon. gentleman approve of the section from Winnipeg to Quebec? I understand him to say that he does not approve of the section from Quebec to Moncton, and I want to know if he includes the section from Winnipeg to Quebec?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, he says so.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think that the road will be in a financial position to pay in the next fifty years from Winnipeg to Quebec.

Mr. CONMEE. I am asking if the hon. gentleman approves of the building of it.

Mr. HAGGART. Last year I spoke on the subject for nearly an hour, and I had the honour of being supported by the government party; they took my speech as the pattern for theirs in explaining the building of the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. FIELDING. That accounts for the mistakes.

Mr. HAGGART. And they paid me the compliment of giving me the credit of saying that I was the first to initiate or suggest it. But, when we come to such a road as the government are at present building between Winnipeg and Quebec with the prospect of extending it to Halifax or St. John and when we come to consider the claim that it can be industrially used for the purpose of conveying the grain from the Northwest to the sea-board, I do not think there is a sane man, let alone a railway man, in the country who will say that the project is feasible. It is supported by some politicians who are anxious to get votes in their particular provinces by promising all sorts of imaginary things to the people. The statement made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition as to the financial position of this road is strictly correct. There is nothing in the argument of my hon. friend