

it during an extraordinary flood. This person James Taylor was for a period of twelve years in the H. B. Coy's employment. 6th. Although not at the Stone Fort, during the floods of 1852 and 61, I was then in the Red River Settlement and an eye-witness to both, and from marks made on buildings by me if personally, I can state that the flood of 1852 was four feet higher than that of 1861.

I am,
(Signed) Yours truly,
WM. FLETT.

Hudson's Bay Company
Stone Fort and other
in Chief, C. P. R.

RT GARRY,
January, 1880.

all the information
state of the river

ion, and from per-
n reliable sources,
g your queries as

Fort for the last
e jam at the Stone
oken up gradually
taken place. (a)
this place was on
ne top of the bank.
rt or near it, but
es below the Stone
e c. ly place near
every year more

nt below Selkirk
ho river opposite
ing considerable
r winter quarters
kirk. (c)
Stone Fort or its
prairies to the

banks at or near
the Stone Fort,
have happened,
e from near
e. hat point
d could not see
uth. (e)

emiag, the height

I, EDMUND R. ABELL, Engineer-in-chief to the Hudson Bay Company, make the following statement:
I have resided at Lower Fort Garry since the year 1865, and have a thorough knowledge of the Red River of the North, having navigated the same from Breckenridge in the State of Minnesota, United States, to its mouth at Lake Winnipeg, since 1861. I have seen the break up of the ice on the Red River at the Stone Fort for the last fifteen consecutive seasons. During all these years I have seen no ice jam at the Stone Fort or in its vicinity, but have known it to jam several times at Sugar Point, (f) about three and a half miles below the Stone Fort causing the water to rise at the Stone Fort. The highest I have known the back water to rise at the Stone Fort from this or any other cause is to within twelve or fifteen feet of the top of the bank. I have also known the ice to jam at the first point below the village of Selkirk, (g) causing the water to overflow the low land on the east side of the river to a depth of ten feet and forcing the ice back up the creek where our vessels are lying, and driving them for a considerable distance from their moorings, and actually stranding one of the vessels on top of the bank. (h)
From my knowledge of the configuration of the banks of the river at the Stone Fort, I do not think it possible for a jam to take place, nor have I ever known any ice jam below the Fort so as to annually taken back raise the water to force the ice over the top of the bank. As regards the flow of ice, it is so broken, and smashed up passing at the present moment are moored over the St. Andrews Rapids, that there are no pieces of sufficient size to cause an ice jam at the Stone Fort. (i)

(j) The jam took place about 2 miles above the proposed bridge crossing at Selkirk.
(k) No statements to the contrary have been made. The back water does not rise high enough to affect the bridge. The site would be in still water.
(l) And yet the H. B. Coy's vessels are usually taken back to the same place and at the present moment are moored there. The bank at this spot is only some two or three feet above water.
(m) Is this consistent with the statement made respecting the ice forming a jam after it passes Stone Fort, Manitoba, 27th January, 1880.

(Signed)

ED. R. ABELL.

JAMES FRENCH, Groom to Hudson Bay Coy., Lower Fort Garry.

I have resided at the Stone Fort continually for the last fifteen years, and have seen the ice break up each spring. I have never seen any jam of ice at this point, nor the water or ice rise higher than within fifteen (15) feet of the top of the bank. This rise is caused partly if not altogether by the ice jamming at a place called Sugar Point, and at a point further down. And the ice jamming at Sugar Point is a yearly occurrence. I have never seen any great rush of ice past this Fort, it being broken up into small pieces coming over the St. Andrews rapids. (k)

(k) This and the preceding statement are not perfectly consistent.