

could possibly be done? I think both parties agreed to that. The House consented to it, at all events, and it was adopted. Then, the whole thing comes down to this: the hon. gentlemen says, if they had stopped after spending \$110,000, he would not have blamed them. Well, it is only \$70,000 more, even though it were an error of judgment. The hon. gentleman shakes his head.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—I said I believe the blunder will amount to \$500,000 before the thing is done. It is not nearly finished.

Hon. Mr. BROWN—The hon. gentleman is very unbelieving. Now, I have got in my hand the report brought down this year, in which I find the following:—

“The rock excavation of the lock-chamber is nearly completed. The timber for the gates will be obtained during the winter.”

I went to the Public Works Department, to-day, to find out something about this work, and was informed by one of the professional men engaged on it, that very little more money will be required to complete it—that the rock excavation was almost finished.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—What is the depth of the lock?

Hon. Mr. BROWN—Here is what the report says:—

“This canal will connect the 44 miles of navigable water of Rainy Lake with Rainy River and the Lake of the Woods, making a continuous navigation, from Kettle Falls to the North-West Angle, of 164 miles, with 7 feet depth of water.”

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—I state with the most perfect confidence, that cannot be done for \$500,000.

Hon. Mr. BROWN—Then, the hon. gentleman will see, if it will cost half a million—and it is not wise to spend that amount on this work—it will not be spent, and if the Government come to the House to ask for it, let him vote nay; but let the hon. gentleman not talk of \$500,000 at a time when the expenditure has really been only \$70,000 more than he says he was willing should have been expended if they had stopped there. It appears to me that the Government in this have acted most wisely, because, admitting, as the hon. gentleman does, that this work was undertaken with the belief that it was for the good of the whole Dominion and necessary for the Pacific Railway, that it was

Hon. Mr. Brown.

honestly and rightly gone about, I say it would have been folly to have stopped at \$110,000, when the connection between these two great water stretches will be made for the people who settle there, at any rate. How would it have done to have left the works in the middle to decay? I say it was far wiser to go on, even for the use of the people who go in there.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—There never will be any settlers there, in all probability.

Hon. Mr. BROWN—The hon. gentleman says there will never be any settlement there “in all probability.” I was told that when I came to Canada with regard to a great many counties that are now filled with people. It is not long since I heard people say “there never will be any settlement in Muskoka;” there are some of the finest farms in Canada there now; and we were told the same with respect to other counties that are now covered with settlements. The hon. gentleman goes there and, as he passes through the country, sees a little of it—not a millionth part of it—and he comes to the conclusion that it is unfit for settlement. Let him go to Scotland, and see the hundreds of thousands of acres that we were told in his day would never be settled—why, the fields blossom like the rose in places where it was not dreamed in our time anything could be cultivated. It is absurd, in opening up a great country like that, to try and bring down every little thing to bear out their particular view of it. Do they think any member of the other House has taken the ground that is assumed here? Not at all. I very much regret that such a feeling should be shown in this House. I think we should look broader and higher altogether, than to be bringing down little petty things like this, and trying to make accusations against the Government. The whole thing seems as if the hon. gentleman were in a very cross humor. I have known days in which we have seen a very different feeling displayed, when grants of \$10,000,000 were spent in public works without much advantage from them, and not a word came from the hon. gentleman against his friends who then held the Treasury Benches. I think it is not for the hon. gentleman who approved of the expendi-