

that there is a competent engineer under Mr. Stewart, having jurisdiction over the canals from Cornwall up to the Murray canal, just as Mr. Rubidge had. I refer to Mr. Sargent. He is in Cornwall assisting in this work, and was up at the Murray canal overseeing some other work when the accident happened. My hon. friend speaks as if there never was a break in the Cornwall canal before. When the hon. gentleman tells the House that there is no engineer in charge from Cornwall to the Murray canal, I tell him there is, and has been.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister states that Mr. Sargent is an engineer under Mr. Stewart. Now the minister knows that Mr. Sargent was the engineer in charge of the work at Cardinal, in charge of Murray and Cleveland's work, and has been living there for the last ten years. He knows that Mr. Sargent has only been placed in the position he speaks of within the last three weeks.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is stating what is absolutely without foundation. Mr. Ross was the engineer under Mr. Stewart on that canal. He was transferred to the Sault, and a gentleman came from the Sault to take the place as overseer. Mr. Sargent is there, and has been acting for months as engineer.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Ross's position was only that of overseer.

Mr. GRAHAM. He was an engineer.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Ross is not an engineer. I have known Mr. Ross for the last twenty years, and I make the statement that he is not an engineer. Mr. Ross was sent out from this department to oversee the works at Cardinal, and has been working there for the last 15 or 20 years. I never heard of Mr. Ross passing any examinations or qualifying himself for engineer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I call attention of the committee that the item before us is the Welland canal. There is another for the Cornwall canal.

Mr. PRINGLE. I do not intend to resurrect the old lighting contract on the Cornwall canal. But I want to say that I agree with the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) that Mr. Stewart was not the man who should have charge of the canal, and I am pleased to see that the government has come to that conclusion, and have placed Mr. Sargent in charge of the Cornwall canal, not only of the Cornwall canal, but of all the canals up to the Murray canal. Mr. Sargent has been located in Cornwall for some months, and is residing there, and is a thoroughly competent engineer. Now, to come back to the subject under discussion, the lighting of the Welland canal by electricity, so far as I am concerned, I want to see the money spent

where it can be spent in the best interest of navigation. The expenditure of a few thousands for electricity on the Cornwall canal has come up here time and time again, it is brought up nearly every year. It may cost a good deal of money, but it is the greatest advantage to navigation we can possibly have. Large vessels are coming down the Cornwall canal carrying 65,000 bushels of grain, and they do not now use lamps as they did in the old time, when vessels had to tie-up and suffer delays for hours. They go right through now, in the night time as well as in the day time. I do not want to discuss the terms of the contract, that has been discussed over and over again in this House. The government have made a contract that I imagine they will have to stand by. This is what I want to get at. Is this increased cost justifiable, and in what way does it aid navigation? I understand that these vessels can go through much more quickly to-day, with these modern electrical appliances to operate the locks, than they could some years ago. I do not know whether I am right or wrong, but I think the Soulages canal was the first one on which the locks were operated by electricity, and I think the plan has been a great success, that a great deal of time has been saved. Now, the minister has with him an engineer who has had a great deal of experience in these matters, and he can tell us whether this plan is going to aid navigation in the Welland canal. Can a vessel go through more quickly, once these electrical appliances are put into effect? If it can, then it is a decided advantage. We know that late in the fall of the year these vessels are crowding down, every minute is important to them, we have to, in the fall, open our canals on Sunday, so they are operated every day in the week. Now I want to say a word with regard to that break. That is not the first break that has occurred in the Cornwall canal. We must remember that the Cornwall canal was originally built with a depth of 10 feet, and that has been increased to 14 feet. That extra 4 feet has increased the danger to the banks of the canal. There is a long stretch from lock 20 down to the lock at the mouth of the Cornwall canal that is dangerous, and always will remain dangerous. Six or seven years ago in this House I advocated with the then Minister of Railways and Canals the putting in at lock No. 20 another lock to the river. I understand that when the deputy minister, Mr. Butler, came into the department he saw the advantage of it, and that plans have been prepared, and that this will probably become an accomplished fact. If it had been done a few years ago the whole navigation of the country would not have been tied up as it is to-day. In so far as that break is concerned, it was a most unfortunate occurrence. It probably could have