

marks that the government have abandoned the idea ?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Not at all. The hon. gentleman may perhaps one of these days see advertisements for tenders, but what I recognize, and what I think every gentleman who will give his mind to it will recognize, is that there has been no serious loss, at all events up to the present time—that Canada has not suffered in consequence of the delay, particularly in view of the increased speed that year by year is being attained by vessels crossing the Atlantic.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—When will the limit of speed be reached ?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I do not know. The increase is going on day by day. I suppose when we have a better energy producer than coal ; that is my idea about it, but at present, where you sacrifice everything to speed, there is very little space left for freight.

Another subject to which my hon. friend has adverted as an omission from the speech, is the Pacific cable. I think my hon. friend knows exactly the position of that. The papers were brought down to this Chamber last session, indicating that a contract had been made—that the ground had been selected at the Pacific coast—that the work was being carried on with as much speed as possible. I quite agree with him that the Pacific cable has not had fair play in the past, but I think neither the government of which he was a member nor the present government was responsible for the delay. I do not pass any strictures on those who are responsible. He knows them well, and any gentleman who chooses to study the question as I have had to study it, can arrive at only one conclusion, that there is a rival concern in which public men in Great Britain have very large interests, and necessarily they look with some degree of jealousy on so important a rival as a cable across the Pacific with a probable extension round the globe through British waters and on British territory. The Eastern Extension has been the opponent that has had to be fought during the last ten years since the Pacific cable was first projected. That company has thwarted it, and succeeded in postponing the time for laying the Pacific cable, and has succeeded, in that interval,

in counteracting many of the advantages financially that would have followed from the Pacific cable occupying the ground eight or ten years ago. As far as our policy is concerned, it is to finish the cable as rapidly as possible. Our commissioner on the board is doing that, and I think the gentlemen who represent the other parts of the empire are of the same mind.

The hon. gentleman made some severe criticisms in reference to the Intercolonial Railway. I presume if some of my remarks were looked up, I would be found for many years to have made—perhaps not exactly in the same line—pretty sharp strictures on the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway with few benefits flowing from it. As to the observation that we had bought a number of locomotives and farmed them out to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I really do not know the facts, but I presume if it is so, that the locomotives have been too heavy for the bridges, because I notice that it is proposed now to strengthen the bridges in order to enable new locomotives to pass over them, for it appears the bridges on the Intercolonial Railway were built when smaller locomotives were used. We all know that marked changes have taken place in recent years in the engines that haul heavy trains—that the smaller engines have been entirely discarded as not being profitable. The longer the train, the more powerful the engine, the more profitable the work that can be done, and I presume it is on that account, if it is so, that the engines have been farmed out.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—Are the engines too heavy for the bridges or the bridges too light for the engines ?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The bridges are too light for the locomotives. The hon. gentleman had a fling at the Postmaster General's Department. I thought if there was any member of the government who was entitled to credit it was my colleague the Postmaster General. When he was appointed to that position he found a chronic deficit of from \$750,000 to \$850,000. That had been the deficit, if my memory is correct.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I think not.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—\$750,000 was about the ordinary deficit.