

April 1, 1871

Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER said this amendment was equally objectionable with the others that had been moved to prevent to passing of the address, and he would announce to the House, and to the hon. member for Sherbrooke, that the Government intended and determined that this great railway should be carried out by companies and not by the Government, and through the means principally of land grant and small money subsidies, and further that early in the ensuing week, the Government would place before the House a resolution by which to take the sense of the House with regard to the manner in which that Railway should be built, and he might announce beforehand that the determination of the Government was that, when the sense of the House had been so taken, they would carry it out more prudently with regard to the Exchequer of the country than was proposed in the amendment of the hon. member for Sherbrooke.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that the terms of the amendment were so general that he was not prepared to vote for it.

Mr. BLAKE said he must oppose the amendment not only for the reason named by the hon. member for Lambton, but because he considered that no action could put an interpretation on the terms other than that they literally contained.

Mr. BOWELL said his great objection to the amendment was that it did not go far enough for it would not prevent the Government from carrying on the Railway after its construction.

The amendment was lost, the vote being—Yeas, 7; Nays, 126.

The main motion was then carried and the address read a second time, and on the motion of **Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER** the address was ordered to be engrossed, and a motion for an address to His Excellency, praying His Excellency to transmit the address to Her Majesty the Queen was carried; the address to His Excellency was ordered to be engrossed, and to be presented by such members of the House as belonged to the Privy Council.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS

The following Private and Local Bills were read a second and third time and passed:—

An Act to comprise in one Act the financial affairs of the Great Western Railway Company, as amended by Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.—**Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Peel)**.

An Act concerning the Vandreuil Railway Company, as amended by Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.—**Mr. SHANLY**.

An Act to incorporate the Metropolitan Bank, as amended by Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.—**Mr. WORKMAN**.

An Act to incorporate the Western Bank, as amended by Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.—**Mr. KILLAM**.

* * *

SUPPLY

On the motion of **Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS** to go into Committee of Supply,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON called the attention of the Government to the manner in which a certain parcel of land belonging to the Dominion was leased to the Montreal Warehousing Company. The history of the land was this: In 1865 Government purchased from private parties in Montreal a lot of land adjoining the canal basin, on the recommendation of Mr. Allan, for the purpose of increasing the wharfage and shed accommodation there. For this lot the Government paid the sum of \$25,000. The Warehousing Co., through Mr. Brydges, made application to Government for the purchase of the lot subsequent to confederation of the Provinces, but on the advice of the officers of the Public Works Department, the Government refused to sell it. On the 19th July, 1870, the hon. the Minister of Militia, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, and acting for that minister, reported to the Council in favor of granting the lease of this lot to the Warehousing Company for a term of 21 years with an annual rental of \$700, that being considered less than simple interest on one half the cost. This report was made to the Privy Council without being supported by any of the professional gentlemen connected with the Department. One of the conditions, however, was that the Government might resume possession of the property on giving three months' notice, on condition of paying for any building that might be erected thereon, subsequent to the lease of the property. He, therefore, moved an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, reciting the facts above stated, and resolving "that this House is of opinion that it is the duty of this Government to take immediate steps to resume possession for public uses, of the said lot of ground."

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said he would take the full responsibility of the transaction on himself. He had no desire to shield himself behind the Minister of Militia in this matter. The action in the matter was taken while he (Hon. Mr. Langevin) was absent, but it was with his entire approval. What he had to complain of was that the hon. member for Châteauguay had not gone farther back in the history of this affair. The hon. member knew quite well that in order to arrive at the true position of affairs, it was necessary to go back further than 1865. In 1851 the Government of the day offered for