

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. member had asserted time and again that we had not the means of constructing the road, yet he proposed to take away the most necessary means at the command of Government. It was an insidious attempt to destroy the road. The proposition was to put a tax upon the people of the older provinces in order to let the emigration of the world go into the North-West and enjoy a country we have opened up. There was plenty of land open for free settlement beyond the twenty-mile belt along the line of railway. It was preposterous to ask the people of Canada to pay for constructing a road past the doors of future settlers in the North-West.

Mr. YOUNG considered this the most objectionable part of the whole scheme. The American Congress, in granting aid to railways, never agreed to hold alternate blocks for sale only. He would prefer that a larger money grant should be given the company. The free-grant system had been tried with older provinces and proved successful. The practical result of this large land grant and reserve would be to prevent the free-grant system being adopted in the North-West.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said his object was to have the North-West rapidly settled. Now, we were not paying the money. We were borrowing it, and every man settling in the North-West would aid in paying off the debt. His object was rapid settlement and consequently the rapid payment of the debt. All his resolution provided for was that the company should not prevent the settlement of the lands. He desired that the right of pre-emption should obtain alike over the company's and over the Government lands, and it was advisable to provide that nothing in the Act should prevent the Government from making provision for free-grants either in the alternate blocks they reserved or elsewhere.

Hon. Sir A.T. GALT opposed the amendment on the ground that it was an interference with the lands granted to the company and so far as it related to the Government lands, it was entirely unnecessary. There was nothing in the bill binding the Government in giving these lands to settlers as free grants. He would oppose the resolution, because he believed it unfair to the company undertaking the construction of the road.

Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER contended that if the course proposed by the member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) were adopted, they would have to borrow \$100,000,000 which would involve an annual charge upon the revenue of \$5,000,000 which would have to be met by increased taxation.

The House divided on **Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE'S** amendment:—Yeas, 33; Nays, 101.

(Division No. 26)

YEAS

Members

Blake
Bowman
Cheval

Bourassa
Carmichael
Coupal

Delorme (Saint-Hyacinthe)
Fortier
Godin
Joly
Mackenzie
McConkey
Mills
Oliver
Pelletier
Rymal
Snider
Thompson (Haldimand)
Whitehead
Young—33

Dorion
Fournier
Holton
Kempt
Magill
Metcalfe
Morrison (Victoria North)
Pâquet
Ross (Wellington Centre)
Scatcherd
Stirton
White (Halton)
Wood

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Archambault
Barthe
Beaubien
Benoit
Blanchet
Bowell
Cameron (Inverness)
Carling
Carter
Cartwright
Cimon
Costigan
Crawford (Leeds South)
Currier
Delorme (Provencher)
Drew
Ferguson
Fortin
Gaucher
Gendron
Gray
Hagar
Jackson
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Lawson
Macdonald (Sir John A.)
Masson (Soulanges)
McCallum
McDougall (Trois-Rivières)
Merritt
Morrison (Niagara)
Nathan
O'Connor
Pinsonneault
Pouliot
Renaud
Ross (Champlain)
Ross (Prince Edward)
Ryan (King's, N. B.)
Scriver
Simard
Sproat
Street
Tilley
Tremblay
Wallace (Albert)
Walsh
White (Hastings East)
Workman—101

Anglin
Ault
Beaty
Bellerose
Bertrand
Bolton
Burpee
Campbell
Caron
Cartier (Sir George-É.)
Chauveau
Colby
Crawford (Brockville)
Cumberland
De Cosmos
Dobbie
Dugas
Forbes
Galt (Sir A.T.)
Gaudet
Grant
Grover
Hincks (Sir Francis)
Keeler
Lacerte
Lapum
Little
McDonald (Middlesex West)
Masson (Terrebonne)
McDougall (Lanark North)
McGreevy
Morris
Munroe
Nelson
Perry
Pope
Pozer
Robitaille
Ross (Dundas)
Ross (Victoria, N. S.)
Ryan (Montreal West)
Shanly
Smith (Selkirk)
Stephenson
Thompson (Cariboo)
Tourangeau
Tupper
Wallace (Vancouver Island)
Webb
Willson

Hon. Mr. WOOD said one of the main functions of Parliament was to control the public expenditure and by an annual vote the power of Parliament in this respect was shown; therefore no scheme should be presented to the House requiring Parliament to divest itself of this power over expenditure, and no scheme that did so, however excellent in other respects, could be acceptable security because it was one of the most pointed and violent breaches that could be made of the constitution of the House. In the proposition before the House the enormous sum of thirty millions was proposed