

June 11, 1872

On the item of \$20,000, towards the enlargement of Carillon and Chute à Blondeau canals, with dam and slides for the passage of lumber,

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE asked for some explanation of this item, in reply to which

Mr. CURRIER reviewed the Ottawa canal system and the object of the proposed expenditure.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said it would appear that the Government were in the habit of imparting information to some members which they withheld from others, and asked if they were to accept the statement of the hon. gentleman as correct.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN replied that the member for Ottawa had been one of a deputation which waited on the Government in reference to the improvement of the navigation of the Ottawa River, and he had no doubt his hon. friend had correctly stated the circumstances, but he had not been able to hear his remarks. He would state, however, that the proposed work had been recommended by the Engineer of the Department of Public Works some years previously, and it had been urged that that work had been carried out instead of enlarging the Chute à Blondeau and Carillon Canals. If a dam and lock were built, the Carillon and Chute à Blondeau rapids would be flooded, and the present Carillon and Chute à Blondeau canals would not be used; but the locks in the new works on the Ontario side would be used by the steamboats and other craft on the Ottawa and the slide at that place would be used for the cribs which would benefit and be more satisfactory to both the navigation and lumber interests, at the same time reducing the present expenditure, and doing away with a large annual cost to keep the canals in repair.

Mr. WRIGHT (Ottawa County) had been one of a deputation to the Government, and considered that the work was regarded as a link in the great chain of Ottawa navigation, which had been favoured by both sides of the House, and he thought the item should be allowed to pass without further discussion.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE asked if the Government had decided upon a policy as to the depth of canal navigation.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN replied that they had adopted the recommendation of the Canal Commissioners in regard to the canals of the Ottawa, viz., to have the locks 200 feet by 45 feet. Beyond that the Government had decided nothing. Some persons had made the remark that a depth of nine feet was too great; but the Government had decided that at all events between Ottawa and Montreal, that should be the depth of the locks.

Mr. SHANLY said the construction of a lock built for Grenville this year would, of course, guide the navigation of the Ottawa, and he entirely differed from the Canal Commissioners in the nine foot navigation. It would lose but little more to make it one foot deeper, and, judging from the low water of past years, he thought the Government should take warning and make all locks ten feet on the

sills, no matter what the depth of the canals might be. He considered the vote asked a very small one in view of the large works undertaken, and he would like to see a sum voted annually for the next few years, until navigation from Ottawa to Montreal was completed. The vote asked would carry out the greatest possible improvement. The work contemplated would have about twenty-six feet of locking, as compared with the present system, and although he had previously opposed the construction of dams to improve navigation, he believed that in this case the dam could be built with the greatest success. He would again urge that, at the Grenville Canal locks were to be nine feet, the sills of all other locks to be constructed should be absolutely ten feet below the level of the Ottawa.

On the item of \$5,000 for damages arising out of the construction of the dam at the head of Beauharnois Canal,

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said it seemed as if these damages would never cease, and asked what the damages were. It would be better to buy the land altogether.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the damages had to be paid for, but in the proposed enlargements of canals, care would be taken that in future the deeds taken should cover all damages.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE repeated his enquiry what the damages were, and whether they had not been paid for already?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said they had not.

Mr. MASSON (Soulanges) maintained the just nature of the claims for damages.

Mr. CAYLEY spoke in French.

The item was concurred in.

* * *

CANAL CONSTRUCTION

On item of \$3,490,000 for construction of canals,

Mr. McCONKEY said he regretted that no assistance had been proposed for the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal. They did not want any money; a company was prepared to build it if they only got a grant of lands. He thought the time had come when something should be done with reference to this important subject.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS objected that he was out of order.

Mr. McCONKEY in order to obtain an opportunity of speaking on the subject, moved an amendment. He then went into the steps that had been taken in the matter, and repeated his regret that the Government had taken no notice of such a great national undertaking. He moved that the item be referred back to Committee of the Whole, to consider the propriety of subsidizing, by grants of lands or otherwise, the projected Georgian Bay Canal; a work in the