

Mr. PUGSLEY. The deputy minister thinks it will be completed in a year.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). There is a very serious state of affairs prevailing at that place. A year ago last summer that dam which had cost some \$14,000 or \$15,000, was blown out by the government, and since that time navigation on the lake has been very materially affected, and the industries around the lake have been in rather a bad way for want of water. It seems to me that this work should have been proceeded with before this. If the former dam was required, and it was required, I do not see why it should have been blown up. I am aware that people complain that some of the land around the lake was being flooded. I know that is the case, but the reason was because the dam had been improperly constructed, and did not provide for the overflow of water in the spring. I was under the impression when that dam was blown out and the \$16,000 spent there thrown away, that the department would look after the matter in a business way and take immediate steps to reconstruct it. I did not urge the matter very earnestly upon the minister for the reason that I thought pressure was being brought from another quarter which, perhaps, would have more effect. Possibly I did not do my duty in that I neglected to urge more strenuously on the minister and the department the completion of this work at an earlier date than is contemplated. I have met the engineers of government there repeatedly both before the dam was blown out and since then, and thinking that the department was thoroughly posted as to the requirements of the different business interests around the lake I did not urge the matter as strongly as I should. I am painfully surprised to know that the work is to be so greatly delayed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think my hon. friend need accuse himself that he has not urged the matter on the attention of the department more forcibly because I do not think it would make any difference for the reason that we wanted to move carefully. I took the responsibility for having the old dam blown out because if it were not done a large portion of the town of North Bay would have been flooded, and a large portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway track washed away. I had to act quickly, and I gave orders to have it blown out by dynamite so as to prevent the destruction of valuable property. We have had to pay pretty heavy land damages, and before rebuilding the dam I thought the engineers should look into the matter with the utmost care so as to be sure that no such result would occur again. I have proceeded as rapidly as we reasonably could in view of the large amount of work the

department has to attend to. We will get the dam built as rapidly as we can and I think I can assure the hon. gentleman that during the present year it will be completed, and I trust it will be found entirely satisfactory.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is a dam in the county of Frontenac that I wish the minister would blow up and I will not ask him to rebuild it because it costs the municipality from \$400 to \$700 a year to pay for the damage done by flood.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some dams do more harm than one would think.

Mr. EDWARDS. Has any appropriation been made this year for dredging Kingston harbour. The interest I have in it is that the dredging of that part of the harbour down towards the old smelter site would facilitate the removal of the iron ore.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That matter is not only under consideration but under favourable consideration. I received a deputation a short time ago, and that is part of the work laid down in our programme.

Draping Dominion public buildings on occasion of death of His late Majesty, \$27,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When His late Majesty died we had to ask for a Governor General's warrant for \$35,000 and we only expended \$27,000.

Mr. PORTER. Upon what principle was that money expended in the various towns and cities?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We were guided somewhat by the population and the importance of the different cities and towns. I could give some illustrations.

Mr. PORTER. Give me Belleville.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Belleville \$100, Berlin \$100, Alexandra \$50.

Mr. EDWARDS. How much for Kingston?

Mr. PUGSLEY. \$391.10 for the different public buildings there.

Mr. PORTER. Through whom was the expenditure made in Belleville?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The usual course would be for the chief architect to give directions to the caretaker to expend in draping the building not more than \$100.

Mr. PORTER. From the appearance of the Belleville building I should think it would not cost more than \$20.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to hear that.

Mr. PORTER. It was a disgraceful display. It was very freely remarked on in