

be thoroughly dredged at the bar, to at least 200 feet wide, or 250 feet; then piered and piled on the outside, and a fog whistle established at the outer lighthouse, so that we could find the entrance in foggy weather.

Q. To what depth would the dredging be required? Almost sixteen feet.

Q. With a similar expenditure at Prince Arthur's Landing, for improvements in the shape of a breakwater, how would you compare the two then? Then I would rather go to Prince Arthur's Landing.

Q. Would it be necessary to widen the channel through the bar to a width of 200 or 250 feet, and also dredge the river? I think it ought to be at least 150 feet wide on the bar between the piers.

Q. You think the channel outside the mouth ought to be pierced? Yes.

We have also the opinion of Captain Robertson, who has sailed there four years, and who has been over one hundred times at that place. His statement is, that however rough Lake Superior may be, the moment you get inside Thunder Bay it is perfectly safe, and he never had any trouble at the Landing. Then we have the opinion of Captain Macdonald, who has sailed there one hundred and thirty-six times off and on. He commanded the "City of Duluth," one of the largest vessels on the lake,—that is, calling at the ports on the north shore,—and his evidence is in the same direction. He would give the preference to the Prince Arthur's Landing. On the other side, the hon. gentleman brought a number of captains. Captain Murray has been there thirty-nine times; and then we had three brothers MacMaugh—three brothers who are captains of small vessels, and brought up the railway iron to Thunder Bay. Their opinion is decidedly in favor of the river. One of them was only twice there, another five times, and the other four times. But the evidence of all the captains goes to show this—that so far as Prince Arthur's Landing is concerned, they considered it a good harbor. Captain Symes is the only one who gives the preference to the Kaminstiquia. His vessel is a small boat, and draws but eight or nine feet of water. He can, therefore, go up there with less difficulty than larger vessels experience. He expressed himself very strongly in favor of the river; but an extraordinary

*Hon. Mr. Aikins.*

thing has occurred to Captain Symes this spring. In his first trip he went to the Landing. He was going up the river on a bright night, the range lights were up, the water was calm, and yet Captain Symes ran aground.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The vessel struck a crib that moved in the winter.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—Mr. McKellar does not say it moved in the winter. He says the vessel struck the crib. But a man like Captain Symes, who had been there so often and knew the place so well, on a bright night, without any fog, and with the range lights up, ought not to have stuck fast there if the river was all that he described it. Now, a statement has been made by the hon. Secretary of State with regard to the closing of this river. He says there is not a tittle of evidence to show that the river closes eight days before the harbor does.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I say there is no authentic record kept regularly.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—"No evidence in print," is what the hon. gentleman said.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I contrasted the evidence given by a gentleman who kept a log with the evidence of men who had only their memory to depend on. Captain Symes was the only one who submitted a regular log. I could not stultify myself by saying there was no evidence in print.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—The hon. gentleman left the impression on my mind, and must have left it on the minds of many hon. gentlemen in this House that the only evidence was given by Captain Symes.

Hon. Mr. BROWN—Not at all. I watched the hon. gentleman's statement very closely. He spoke of written evidence as in contradistinction to that which was oral.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—I do not think it is material any way and for this reason, we do not find that Captain Symes left the harbor so very late in the season as to