

ture of \$1,250,000 on the Dawson Route, to complain that an effort was made to go on a cheaper scale—and the Government have certainly succeeded in doing that, and in giving very much more accommodation than the Dawson Route furnished—and when it is admitted that the work was honestly gone about. The hon. gentleman seemed to make a great point about the number of these locks. It appears to me he has not put that fairly. It is not locks the Government have been thinking of, but portages.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—How is Mr. Mackenzie to take steamers over the portages?

Hon. Mr. BROWN—I fail to find any mention of a scheme to take steamers over the portages? We have continuous navigation down the St. Lawrence, yet we use canals.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—Yes, but not portages.

Hon. Mr. BROWN—The hon. gentleman says it is all in the 400 feet. If that 400 feet is divided up in ten portages, why should not ten roads be made, no matter what the height?

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—But how are you to take the steamers over it?

Hon. Mr. BROWN—The hon. gentleman remembers very well when the St. Lawrence was not, as it happily is now, improved so that vessels could pass up by means of canals, and he must know that it will be far easier to carry passengers over the short portages between Lac des Mille Lacs and Rainy Lake, than it was in days that he can remember, to convey passengers and freight from Montreal to Toronto.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—No, no!

Hon. Mr. BROWN—The hon. gentleman should not say “no. no.” There were a great many places on the St. Lawrence where goods had to be portaged, though I do not recollect it myself. The hon. gentleman sees in all those public documents what the intention of the Government is. Right or wrong, take that if you like, but do not say that five millions or any number of millions of dollars will be required for a work which the Government never contemplated doing. I do not regret by any means that the hon. gentleman should have made

this motion, but I would very much have preferred that, under all the circumstances, and in view of the very moderate speech he has made to-day, the tone of which was quite unexceptionable, such a motion should not appear upon the paper. No one would dream of refusing such an inquiry; by all means let him enquire into everything, but I think he should not bring such a motion as this. He asks:—

“1st. Whether the Fort Francis Lock can be “used for the purposes of commerce in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.”

There are a great many other purposes it can be applied to. This is to give an idea of failure, and he takes it from his one-sided point of view.

“So as to form part of the through communication from Lake Superior to Manitoba, and “if not, what improvements will be indispensable?”

Who can tell what will be indispensable! The idea of submitting such a thing to a committee! How can you do that? You must send up there for people who know all about it; you must have engineers and all sorts of witnesses, as if this were not the business of the Government and had not been put before the House from time to time as the work advanced. The Government have concealed nothing; the hon. gentlemen have seen the work themselves. Why do they not bring down a resolution condemning the policy of the Government and say what they will do? That is the fair way to act, and not to put a resolution on record which may never come to anything. This committee may never bring it to a point, but this resolution insinuates all sorts of things against this public work. I think, unless we have a very strong case, we should stand by the Government of the country, and by the credit of our public works. I say it is not right to stand up here and say on mere suspicion, not to our own country only, but to every country in the world, that we bungle our public works, and that we throw money away in an indefensible manner. This resolution will go on the Journals, the speech made by the hon. Secretary of State will not go with it. The statements of the hon. gentleman opposite will be published and republished all over the country, and if the motion is carried to-day it will, in a