

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—Do I understand the honorable gentleman to say that the surveying staff was as large in British Columbia last year as it was in 1873?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—My memorandum does not state in what part of the country the staff was engaged, but I am not aware that any considerable number of engineers were employed anywhere else than in British Columbia on the survey. In 1874 there were six parties, comprising eighteen engineers and assistants; in 1875 there were seven parties, comprising twenty engineers and assistants; and in 1876 there were seven parties, embracing twenty-one engineers and assistants. I assume that a large portion of these—three-fourths of their number—were employed in British Columbia. I am not aware that they were required in any other section, I do not think, therefore, that the Government can be fairly charged with lessening the exploratory or engineering parties. They left in charge the gentleman who had previously control of the engineering parties, and they increased the staff and expenditure, as honorable gentlemen will see by the following figures: From June, 1873, to November, 1873, \$6,000; from November 1873, to June, 1874, \$72,000; from June, 1874, to June, 1875, \$185,000; and from June, 1875, to January, 1877, \$228,000, so that the expenditure has been considerably larger the last half year than any preceding period. I assume, but I do not speak from authority, that this increase is owing to surveys on the Fraser River route. When the Government came into power they found two unanswered protests from British Columbia setting forth that Canada had broken the terms under which British Columbia entered the Union. We found these papers in the Council Chamber, so that the breach was not, at all events, began by us. I have shown the figures in refutation of the statement of the honorable gentleman from British Columbia. I am sure he was without a full knowledge of the facts, and perhaps his statement was a little figurative. The Government addressed themselves to the British Columbia difficulty, and as it has been discussed over and over again in this Chamber. I do not propose to advert to it further than to say that they recognize the terms under which the railway was to be built, but they also recognize the will of the people that it was to be built, as fast as the resources of the country will permit without increasing the taxation.

Hon. Mr. CARRALL—What I did say, and what I repeat, is, that the people of British

Columbia never did expect, nor never asked for the work to be completed quicker than the ability of the Dominion would allow them to do it, but I remarked that the Honorable Secretary of State had stated—which I can prove—that he did not believe the railway would be built in forty years.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I plead guilty to the fact. Soon after I was called to the Government, and before I was called to be a member of this House, when I was addressing an election meeting almost immediately after the change of government, in advertising to the Pacific Railway I did measure its length probably at a longer line than I otherwise should have done. I figuratively expressed that it would take forty years at least. I used it figuratively, and it is not an expression I wish to be bound by. It has been quoted by the honorable gentleman and others. It did drop from me, as those expressions do drop from one occasionally, inadvertently, but I did not attach the importance to my utterances at that time that was proper to a person holding a portfolio in the Government.

Hon. Mr. CARRALL—Perhaps the honorable gentleman will express his regret and say that he has harmonized his views with those of his colleagues. The honorable gentleman will say to the British Columbians that he was sorry for the statement!

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—If it gratifies my honorable friend and allays the irritation of the people of British Columbia, I am quite prepared to say that I harmonize my views with my colleagues. I quite appreciate the heart burnings of the people of British Columbia. No doubt they were brought into the union with glowing hopes that the railway would be constructed in ten or fifteen years, though they see now it is utterly impossible to build it in anything like that time.

Hon. Mr. CARRALL—Under his Government?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Or any other Government. Perhaps the honorable gentleman will look at the vote by which this question was tested in the other Chamber; he will find it stood the whole House against ten. It arose on the resolution of Mr. Ross, of Middlesex, attaching the condition to the British Columbia vote that the road should be built no faster than the resources of the country would allow.

Hon. Mr. CARRALL—Nobody ever asked anything more.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—That vote carried almost unanimously. The leaders of the party which the honorable gentleman so much admires, I think, voted with the present Administration on that question.