

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex), said the return might include any correspondence which had taken place between the authorities at Washington and the Dominion Government, on the subject of wreckage.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD suggested that such correspondence should be made the subject of a separate motion.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex), moved for copies of all contracts or agreements made for the printing of Parliament during the recess, together with all correspondence and papers connected therewith.

Motion agreed to.

ACCIDENT ON THE LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. DESJARDINS, in moving for copies of all correspondence, protests or reports of engineers, in relation to the accident which has recently occurred in section No. 11 of the Lachine Canal, now under contract, said: Before moving this motion, I desire to offer a few remarks. The attention of the public has several times been called to the accidents that have occurred in the construction of the Lachine Canal. Last year I accompanied the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals on a visit to section 11, for the purpose of ascertaining what had caused a suspension of the work there, and the throwing out of employment of two or three hundred laborers in the midst of a severe winter. Recently another accident occurred in that section, having the effect again of stopping the operations of the contractors until next Spring. It is evident if these accidents occur very often, when the work is delivered up, the Government will have to pay heavy damages every year. The particular work in progress there at present is a long pier running from the opening of the canal about a mile up the stream. It is intended to build it water tight, so as to keep the water at the proper level in the basin, and is of the nature of construction called cofferdam. After the last accident, I went to examine that pier and found that, although yet under construction, it looked really in many parts like a ruin. The clay chamber, which had been intended originally to be four or five feet wide, had become in some places ten or twelve feet wide. The weight of clay had evidently canted the crib work towards the basin, so that the contractor had to prop it up with beams and other supports. It has been said, with reference to the works already completed on the Lachine Canal, that their actual want of repairs there was evidently some defect in the original plan. Last year we were called on to vote \$10,000 to repair the dry walls which had been built along the banks of the canal, and it is estimated that not less than \$100,000 more will be required to make the necessary changes, so as to give the works the proper solidity. I think the facts should be enquired into, with the view of ascertaining whether the fault rests upon the Chief Engineer in charge of the work or not. It is very well known that he has not been very happy in his inventions lately. We know he is putting up gates just now that will require all the strength of a man during twelve minutes to open, while the old ones require only one minute. Now we have that one pier that shows manifest defects. I do not know that the responsibility can be put on the shoulders of the contractors, who seem to have done all they could to properly complete these works. Therefore, I think an enquiry should be made, and my motion has that end.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very sorry that the hon. gentleman, in making his motion, to which, of course, there is no objection, the Government being ready to bring down all the papers that can throw any light on the subject, should have felt it his duty to animadvert with so much severity upon the standing and conduct of the Chief Engineer of Canals. I think I may say that if there is a public officer

in the country who stands high, and deservedly high, in its estimation, it is this gentleman. It would require a much cooler statement than that just made by my hon. friend, at all events, to shake my confidence materially in that public officer, and lead me to the conclusion that the accidents that occurred are traceable to the neglect of duty of that officer and to his inability. Every person familiar with contracts knows that difficulties constantly arise in carrying them to completion, and that the contractor at any rate forms a strong opinion that he is not at fault. Of course, the responsibility and expense of those accidents falls on the contractor, who undertakes to do a certain amount of work for a certain sum. To be sure if it can be shown there has been anything defective in the plans or directions given to the contractor, the question will arise as to how it should be dealt with. I shall not hastily conclude that all the strictures made on that officer are entirely deserved until I am able to examine the case more closely.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman opposite make such remarks with regard to Mr. Page, who, I think, is entitled to them. I am quite sure that in the matter of hydraulic engineering we have no man to compare with him in the Dominion. I would be exceedingly glad if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) would always act on his advice for, although he happens to be right in this case, as to the Lachine Canal, he was quite wrong as to the Carillon Canal last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will be quite prepared to discuss that subject, exhaustively, with my hon. friend when the proper time comes.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION TO MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. IVES, in moving for a statement of the number of immigrants who have gone into Manitoba and the North-West Territories for the year ending October 31st, 1880; the number of persons who have purchased lands; the number of persons who have taken homesteads and pre-emption rights; the number of acres sold, the total number of acres taken up and purchased; the total receipts for lands sold or taken up during that period, and the amount hereafter to be received, said: I have not had an opportunity of seeing the return brought down by the Minister of the Interior. I did not know, when I put the notice on the paper, that it was his intention to bring down such a return, nor did I know that a motion was made last Session by the member for Gloucester on the subject. I apprehend the return will not cover the period aimed at in the motion.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe the return just brought down does not specify the period over which it runs; I fancy it runs over more than one year—the return brought down in answer to the motion of the member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin). I think it would be quite convenient if we had a uniform statement on this subject. I suppose the reason why the hon. gentleman mentions the 31st October is that it marks the limit of the departmental year, which ends on that day. I suppose that covers the period not covered by the preceding return. It does not state how long it runs. It would be very important if the usual digest form were given with a yearly return that would convey full information on this subject. I think a distinction between Manitoba and the rest of the North-West would also be useful. Suppose the facts were given showing those who emigrated to Manitoba and left it, and those who have gone thither and settled in that Province.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not look at the return laid on the Table, but I assume it was made in strict response to the motion, I think it would be well were that