

ful in producing prosperity and making us in the lapse of not too many years a wealthy and powerful portion of our great Dominion.

Mr. FRECHETTE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to ; and debate adjourned.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 29th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SOUTH SHORE SUBURBAN RAILWAY.

Mr. LACHAPELLE moved :

That that part of the Fourth Report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, referring to Bill (No. 35), to incorporate the South Shore and Suburban Railway Company, be referred back to the said Committee for further consideration.

He said : I think there is one sufficient reason for my bringing this motion before the House. A very serious question of principle has been raised by those opposing the Bill for the incorporation of this company. That question of principle is this : That the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, as they contend, have the exclusive right to give permission to the company to construct the railway over the Guard Pier. That question has been brought before the Railway Committee by the opponents of the Bill, but, as a matter of fact, it has not been sufficiently discussed in the committee ; in fact, I think I am within the truth when I say that it has not been discussed at all. It is for this reason that I want the Bill to be again referred to the Railway Committee in such a way that we shall have an expression of opinion from the committee on that question of principle. I think that is a sufficient justification for my making this motion, seconded by Mr. Masson.

Mr. MASSON. In seconding the motion which has been moved by my hon friend, I do so on the ground that the discussion of the Bill in the committee was entirely taken up by those in opposition to it. No member of the committee, except the promoter, and one who made a suggestion in regard to one of the details of the Bill, said a word pro or con on the subject. The question of

policy is whether it is in the interest of the public that such a Bill should be passed, the only reason given for reporting against the preamble being that it is not in the interest of the public. Now, the interest of the public is shown by those who are interested in the construction of this railway. On the south side of the St. Lawrence, every municipality for a considerable distance on each side of the proposed bridge is in favour of the Bill. They have expressed their approval of it by their petitions, and I am informed that they are willing to give substantial financial assistance in carrying out the project. Therefore, so far as the south side of the river is concerned, it is clearly in the interest of the public, if the people understand their interest, that the bridge should be built. I am further informed that for the last twenty-four years the building of a bridge, at or near that point, has been a live question in that neighbourhood. On the island side there is no opposition that can be looked upon as having a reasonable basis except what comes from the harbour commissioners, and their opposition refers to a detail and not to the real merits of the scheme. The question of the advisability of having a bridge there does not enter into the discussion, so far as the harbour commissioners are concerned. Their opposition is based on the ground that it is proposed to make use of the Guard Pier, one of the harbour works of Montreal. The plans of that guard pier were submitted to the committee, and they show that at the water's edge it is 250 feet in width, and on the top, 45 feet in width. It was alleged that if an electric tramway were built on the top of that pier, it would be rendered ineffectual for harbour purposes. It was explained by the promoter of the Bill, although the committee did not seem to grasp his statement, that it was not proposed to make use of the top of the pier. It is proposed to make use of the outer side of the pier away from where it is intended by the harbour commissioners at some future time to build wharfs on the inside of the pier, so that the building of the tramway would not in any way, as far as the public is concerned, interfere with the use of the guard pier for harbour purposes. The height of the bridge was referred to, and it was said that it would be impossible of approach except with a very heavy grading. I am informed, and I believe it to be the fact, that that guard pier is at present one mile and one-third in length, and the present height to the top of the embankment or mud-wall bank is 45 feet, so that the difference of grade to reach the pier is not very large. Besides, the promoters of the Bill had an amendment ready, as a matter of detail, providing that the obstruction should be subject to the approval of the harbour commissioners and on such terms as might be agreed upon. The ques-