

be open before the steamer leaves Coteau Landing at all. From Coteau Landing she could very easily signal those in charge of the bridge, and those in charge may be bound to open the swing immediately, under pain of a severe penalty for neglecting to open it within a proper time. But there is no necessity whatever that a steamer should leave Coteau Landing at all for the purpose of passing through the bridge until the swing is first opened. The delay in any case must be very trifling. Colonel Gzowski, I think, in that strange report of his, goes into the commercial question, a matter with which he had nothing whatever to do, unless indeed he acted in this according to the instructions sent to him. But he does undertake to deal with it, and his conclusions on this matter are as lame as those on the other. I understand he is a gentleman of high reputation as an engineer and otherwise, and I do not pretend to say that he did not report exactly what he believes. I confess I do not think it is a report sufficient at all events to justify either the Government or this Parliament in refusing a charter to those who ask for the construction of the bridge if there is nothing else to prevent the granting of it. There are other questions raised of great importance and it is not necessary now to say whether they should induce us to refuse the charter or not, but I must say that, having read over the report carefully, and given it much consideration, I was forced to the conclusion that it did not justify the Government in refusing permission for the construction of a low level bridge.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. the Minister of Public Works refers to Mr. Page's report, and calls my attention to the fact, as he says, that Mr. Page's opinion and Colonel Gzowski's coincide.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: On the main point.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, I think not. I think the hon. gentleman is under a mistake. Mr. Page's whole objection to it was not the high or the low level, but that the piers would cause a rise in the water. Mr. Gzowski never touches that point, and that was the sole point that caused the Railway Committee any difficulty in giving an opinion. It was not whether traffic would be seriously impeded, but whether the channel would be so affected, and the adjacent country so

affected by the rising of the water as to impose a large amount of damages upon the country in consequence. Now, Mr. Gzowski has carefully avoided, as far as I can see, any reference to that point. I only received his report half an hour ago, but, from my hurried reading of it, there is nothing in it that contradicts or is opposed to Mr. Shanly's conclusions in that respect.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: But he has not touched that point at all.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, but that is the sole point which was to decide the policy of building a bridge he had nothing to do with. He dealt simply with the engineering difficulties, and the great point of controversy between Mr. Page and Mr. Shanly, and I think Mr. Keefer, was whether the water would rise in consequence of the piers being built in a certain position. There is no man in America in whose judgment I have more confidence than Mr. Page, but I was compelled to differ from him on that occasion, as I could not see that there was evidence enough to justify us in believing that the water would be seriously raised in consequence of piers being built in the shallow part of the river, or that the flood of water would be seriously affected thereby. There is another point that Col. Gzowski fails to touch, and a very important point. He says a high level bridge will not be so serious an inconvenience as to cost, when compared with a low level bridge, after deducting the expense of maintenance of a bridge which is to be opened or shut when vessels or trains approach. But there is another point he has not touched upon—it would necessitate a very serious grade, and what we have to contend with principally in the construction of our roads is the difficulty of obtaining a proper grade. Now, as an instance of what a grade will effect in promoting the prosperity of roads let me mention one fact, that the largest train that can be taken by the most powerful engine on the Intercolonial Railway is twenty loaded cars, while, on the Canada Southern, where the grades are extremely favourable, every engine takes from 40 to 45 loaded cars over it, thus reducing the cost of transportation immensely. Now, if the construction of a high level bridge at this point necessitates,