

sewers, and I have no doubt that the member for Rougemont did it with the best of motives, showing that he is very much interested in the health of the city of Montreal. We should thank him for it, but I think that the question is in the hands entirely of the provincial board of health.

Hon. Mr. MASSON—Can the hon. gentleman explain how it is that Sir William Hingston said that there was a stagnant pond there? It is not necessary to be an engineer to be able to see that. A boy could see it. The water was so stagnant that a log would remain there for several days. How do you explain that?

Hon. Mr. VILLENEUVE—The first time he complained of it was last year, when the water did not come above the Victoria bridge. The Harbour Commissioners took away an old wharf that was there; and now from above the Victoria bridge there will be an immense amount of water coming in, and there will be no still water in the harbour. Now you have the water coming from the canal, and from the mills; I do not say that it will be a swift current, but there will certainly be a current in the harbour—not the least doubt about it.

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—The explanation which is readily offered to the last remark is that the Harbour of Montreal consists of a number of piers jutting out, and at each pier there is a basin, forming an indentation, in which there is stagnant water, while the current sweeps along the ends of the projecting piers. Nothing can be simpler than to see that if the deposit of the sewer goes into the basin, it will remain there; but if the simple expedient of extending the sewer, by means of a cast-iron pipe, out to the point of the wharf and discharging the sewage into the current were resorted to, nothing more would be necessary.

Hon. Mr. POWER.—Why should that be necessary, because the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal have built these piers in this way and prevented it coming down? I had no idea that my remark was going to cause such an interesting discussion, and a discussion so much out of order, but the hon. gentleman from Kennebec is very emphatic and positive, and I have the greatest

respect for his judgment and knowledge. At the same time, the hon. gentleman from Rougemont read us the opinion of the Dominion engineers and sanitary authorities of the city of Montreal, and some other sanitary authorities, and I do not think the case is closed, but the discussion should not go any further.

The motion was agreed to and the bill was read the third time and passed under a suspension of the rule.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST DEBENTURE BILL.

FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill (107) "An Act respecting certain debentures of the Montreal Turnpike Trust."

The bill was read the first time.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL moved the second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Will the hon. gentleman explain the bill? Is the hon. gentleman able to make as favourable a report on the Montreal Turnpike Trust debentures as on the Harbour bonds?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I am afraid not.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I thought not. They are six per cent bonds, and I heard something of it last year. The interest has not been paid. Is it proposed to release the interest entirely, and to accept a fixed sum in lieu of it, or are they going to accept a new issue of bonds of this Turnpike Trust? What is the intention of the government on that point?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Without going elaborately into the whole matter, I will explain it as well as I can. This bill is a very formidable document, and the hon. gentleman can read it when he has nothing else to do; but, joking aside, the Turnpike Trust has been in default a number of years, and after full investigation into the whole subject, an arrangement was come to between the Turnpike Trust and the government to accept this sum in lieu of its full in-