

THE MONTREAL BRIDGE AND TERMINAL COMPANY.

Mr. PICHE moved second reading of Bill (No. 138) respecting the Montreal Bridge Company and to change its name to the Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company.

Mr. INGRAM. The same objection applies to this Bill as to the other Bill. We have not got a copy of it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is on the file.

Mr. PICHE. The same objection does not apply. It was brought from the Senate on Thursday last and distributed on Friday.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What were the amounts received from foreign railways for use of cars under present traffic arrangements for exchange of cars, by Intercolonial Railway during the year ending 30th June last ?

2. What were the amounts received from Canadian railways ?

3. What were the amounts paid to foreign railways by Intercolonial Railway during the same period ?

4. What were the amounts paid to Canadian railways ?

Hon. C. S. HYMAN (for the Minister of Railways) :

1. \$77,899.07.

2. \$132,335.77.

3. \$25,200.00.

4. \$70,323.00.

HOWARD'S COVE, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Were any surveys or borings made with reference to putting a wharf at Howard's Cove, lot 7, Prince Edward Island ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to construct a wharf there ? If so, when ?

Hon. C. S. HYMAN (acting Minister of Public Works). In answer to the first question, no surveys have been made. In answer to the second, consideration will have to be postponed until reports have been received.

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Mr. GEO. D. GRANT (North Ontario). Some few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the discussion on this Bill, my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor),

Mr. GALLIHER

who is not now in his seat, I am sorry to say, was good enough to say that he would like to have an expression of opinion on this Bill from the member for North Ontario. In the course of his remarks on that occasion, my hon. friend referred to a by-election which took place in my riding some two or three years ago, the contestants in which were the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and myself. The hon. gentleman said that the Manitoba Remedial Bill was one of the issues, if not the principal issue, in that campaign. Now, I cannot let that statement go entirely unchallenged. Necessarily I took considerable interest in that by-election, and therefore must be supposed to know what the issues in it were, and I have this to say that not only was the Manitoba Remedial Bill and the action of the late Conservative government in reference thereto and the action of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), then a candidate, in the same connection—not only were all these matters not principal issues but they were not issues at all. Furthermore I do not think that the Manitoba Remedial Bill or the Manitoba school question has been at all an issue in the province of Ontario since the general election of 1896. I am much afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the memory of my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is not at all dependable; I am afraid his memory plays pranks with him. And in this fear I am rather confirmed by what fell from the lips of his late leader, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who spoke in another place on the 1st of March last. Speaking of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) in relation to another matter then under discussion, Sir Mackenzie Bowell said :

I am utterly at a loss to know or understand how Mr. Taylor could have given utterance to such a statement, unless it be that he talked it over so often with others that he finally believed it himself. That is an idiosyncrasy of some people, as we know.

Well, in the best of good nature, I rather think that in his recollection of what took place in the election in North Ontario that idiosyncrasy of my hon. friend from Leeds has shown itself.

The hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames), who preceded me in this debate on Thursday last, made, in my judgment, a very moderate, calm and dignified statement of the case. He told how generously, how very well indeed, the Protestant minority of Quebec were treated by the Catholic majority of that province. But I rather think, in fact I am strongly of opinion, that the hon. gentleman marred a forceful and eloquent speech by the reference he made to the attitude of hon. members on this side of the House who support the government on this question. On more than one occasion, more frequently than was necessary to my mind, the hon. member for St. Antoine thanked his