of the work as contracted for. Just now he says that the difficulty was that some portion that had been supposed to be solid rock was really débris. Now, it was known that there was great inequality in the bottom of the river, and one of the main difficulties of the original contractors was in making a somewhat level bottom on which to build. That was known before 1878. There were disputes and trouble about that. The working in of the timbers to make a level was a subject of great difficulty, and change, and trouble. That was thoroughly known before this alteration of the plan took place. Now, if the plan was all right, if the contract was all right, if the specifications were all right, what was the defect in the execution which has created this difficulty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid I will have to ask my hon. friend to be good enough to visit my office, or any gentleman in the House who takes an interest in the question, and Mr. Trudeau or Mr. Page will show the plan and point out exactly the given place, and all the particulars as to what led to this very unexpected and untoward accident, which was not so serious, I am happy to say, as it was at first supposed to have been, but which led to the carrying away of a portion of the work. It is nothing very new in the construction of difficult public works of this kind to meet with these accidents. There is nothing extraordinary about it. I am glad to know that the impression which went abroad at the time was exaggerated, and after the fullest examination on the part of Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Page, and an investigation of the whole question, they have stated to me in the most explicit terms, that there was nothing defective in the plan, that it was not to an alteration in the plan that the accident was due, but to the manner in which the work was done. I hope my hon. friend does not insinuate that I would attempt to take refuge from the consequences behind other officers of the Department. But he pressed me very much to know who was primarily responsible, and the only answer I could give him is the answer I got from the Deputy Minister, who is immediately in charge, along with the Chief Engineer.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, the hon, gentleman is not in a position to answer me to-night, and I do not think it would be satisfactory to adopt his method of reaching a solution. We are here to obtain information, in Parliament, for the country. But instead of going to the office I would ask the hon, gentleman to furnish us, at a later stage, with full information with regard to the plan.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will make a note of that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just say, in respect to all these items, that we desire to have the right of discussing them tolerably fully on Concurrence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly.

Mr. BLAKE. In so far as the information is defective, I understand the hon, gentleman will supplement it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I will bring in a special report on the case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The total estimated cost is \$240,000. There is a re-vote of \$14,000, and an additional sum of \$96,000 will be required to complete the work.

88. St. Peter's Canal...... \$14,500 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This work is for the protection of the north entrance on the east side—the construction of a pier 330 feet in length, its top to be 6 feet above the level of the Bras d'Or Lake.

# RAILWAYS AND CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

CANALS.

91. Cornwall Canal—Construction of a drain between town and canal... \$23,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. This is a revote. How is it that the work has not been done?

Mr. BERGIN. I can state the reason to the hon. gentleman. Mr. Page explained to me that brick of a particular shape was required, and that it could not be obtained at Cornwall, unless arrangements were made the previous year, as the clay required to be turned out the year before, and if such bricks were obtained from Montreal or elsewhere the estimate would be very largely exceeded. He had placed himself in communication with brick manufacturers at Cornwall, for the purpose of having such bricks made, in order that the work might be done within the estimate.

93. Miscellaneous. ..... \$30,000 00

Mr. THOMPSON. Is any portion of this money devoted to increasing the depth of water in the Burlington Bay Canal? I understand a deputation has waited on the Government in respect to this matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject is not dealt with in this vote.

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and at (1:05 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 24th March, 1884.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## ADJOURNMENT-ANNUNCIATION DAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that when the House adjourns to day, it stand adjourned until three p.m. Wednesday next.

Motion agreed to.

### CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in introducing Bill (No. 127) to further amend the Criminal Law, said: The object of the Bill is to prevent the publication of immoral newspapers and other immoral public prints. I cannot do more than have it printed and distributed to parties who have interest in matters of that kind with the view to legislation next Session.

Bill read the first time.

### POSTMASTER AT DUART.

Mr. CASEY enquired, Whether the Postmaster General has received a petition from residents of Duart and vicinity complaining of the appointment of Ephraim Britton as postmaster of Duart, for reasons therein set forth, and asking that his appointment be cancelled and T. C. Macdonald be appointed in his stead; and whether the Government have taken, or intend to take, any action in consequence of said petition?

Mr. CARLING. I think the hor. gentleman is aware that we have received a petition, as it has been acknowledged to him from the Department. It is not the present intention to cancel Mr. Britton's appointment, and appoint Mr. Macdonald instead.