

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The completion will give a stretch of navigation between Lakofield, $9\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Peterboro' and Balsam Lake, opening up about 150 miles of direct and lateral navigation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What might be the distance as the crow flies?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should say the direct navigation would be about 100 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In all these cases there is a considerable curvature, and you go in and out a good deal from one lake to another. I should think the distance from Lakofield to Balsam Lake could not be, in a straight line, as much as 100 miles.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It is about 100 miles by the course of navigation. It is a devious route, following the waters.

Mr. BLAKE. May we hope that before Concurrence the hon. gentleman will be able to get Mr. Rabridge's report?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope so.

Mr. BLAKE. Because I was sorry to hear a statement that the cost would be about \$6,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid it will be over that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is not taking any vote for that this year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the depth of water over it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The depth on the sill is 5 feet. Dimensions of locks, 134 feet; breadth, 33 feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be about the dimensions of the present Rideau canal navigation, I think?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose so.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is not intended to utilize the canal then, for communication between Lakes Huron and Ontario for lake-going vessels, ultimately?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Simply for internal communication?

85. Ste. Anne Canal \$241,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that cover the whole?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a revote, and completes the work of enlarging the Ste. Anne's Canal and improvement of the approaches.

85 $\frac{1}{2}$. Carillon Canal, Dam and approaches \$191,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. About this dam, a good deal has happened since last Session. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us something about that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Carillon Canal, dam and slide, a revote of \$191,000. This is required to complete the dam and settle with the contractors for the canal, dam and slide; also the improvement of the channel leading to the canal: no additional vote is required. It is not expected that anything will be required beyond the vote taken for this purpose last year. The hon. gentleman no doubt refers to an accident which occurred in connection with this work during the past season, in which considerable damage was done through the carrying away of certain works, and I am glad to be able to state that there was no defect in the plan. Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer, having gone exhaustively into this question, Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

has satisfied himself that the plan was perfectly correct, and it was in the execution of the work, in consequence of there being a failure to fasten a portion of this work at the bottom, in the way designed in the plan, that there was this loss of a portion of the work.

Mr. BLAKE. Who pays?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I am afraid that we will have to pay.

Mr. BLAKE. How much do we pay?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will not be so large as was supposed; the original estimate will not be very much exceeded in the completion of the work.

Mr. BLAKE. One would like to know what contractors it was that worked so defectively. The engineer says the plan was all right and the execution was wrong, and some work that was required to be done was not done. What contractors was it who made this failure? Are they contractors in the employment of the Government now, in this work or in any other work? Who was the officer who should have supervised this, and under whose supervision the work was so defective? What will be the cost to the country, consequent upon the defective execution of the work?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The late Mr. Merrill was in direct charge and overseer of this work, and, I am afraid, was responsible for the failure at this particular point. It was extremely difficult work, I suppose one of the most difficult works that was ever undertaken in this part of the country, or in almost any other. It was the construction of a work which had baffled the efforts of engineers, to a very large extent. It was dealing with the stoppage of a great volume of water at a place where there was a very rapid current, and it was extremely difficult work to do. I believe there is no fault chargeable upon the contractors. They carried out the work as they were directed; but there was unfortunately an oversight on the part of the person who was immediately in charge of the execution of this work, and who was a man of great ability and experience. He had been engaged originally in designing this work, and there was no doubt on the part of the Department of his vigilance in carrying it forward. Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Page satisfied themselves there was an oversight at this particular spot. As I say, they were dealing with a bottom that was supposed to be solid rock; but I believe at this particular part there was some *débris* that had been overlooked.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot say that the hon. gentleman's explanation satisfies my mind. He says it was a very difficult work; that no plan was altered; that no system was altered, though he says that his engineer reports that the altered system was all right. Now, in dealing with an exceptionally difficult work of this kind, under an altered system, presumably, the detailed mode of construction would be stated in the contract, the specification or arrangement. There must have been, necessarily, some plan laid down. The hon. gentleman says there was no fault in the engineer who made the plan, no fault on the part of the contractors, but a default on the part of the dead man—pretty hard on the dead man. We would like to ascertain how it is that the contractors could not have been at fault. If the contractors were not at fault it must have been in the terms of the contract, because I should think the preparation of the contract would have included the necessary elements for the successful prosecution of the work—would have indicated what the contractors had to do; and the engineer in charge ought to have seen that the contractors carried out the contract. The hon. gentleman stated, in the first place, as I understood him, that there was some defect in certain connections; that probably a connection had not been made between parts