

terests, is at all necessarily dependent upon an arrangement being made with the Hudson's Bay Company, because the alternative power might be granted to the Government to give the township subject to the Hudson's Bay Company's lot, or after arrangements were made with the Hudson's Bay Company for the exchange of the lot, else the whole policy of the measure is made dependent on the bargain which may be made with the Hudson's Bay Company, because you cannot grant the townships at all unless you can make an arrangement with them as to their property. The substance of the proposal can be carried out, though not perhaps so effectually, by granting the township exclusive of the Hudson's Bay Company's lot. That is the first observation I have to make. The second one is that this proposal is in its terms susceptible of being carried out with reference to lands wherever they may be granted in the North-West Territory as railway aid, and therefore in that portion of the country which is suitable for settlement—I mean for agricultural settlement as distinguished from ranche and pasture lands—and yet the provision is that:

"The grants of land so made shall include the statutory allowance for roads between sections in the townships and fractional parts of townships so granted, but shall be subject to a reserve of one acre out of every one hundred acres for the establishment of trails, with convenient watering places, for the purpose of driving and watering cattle."

Well, that is a proposal that there shall be a departure from the general system of survey and such advantages as may belong to the adjoining townships through the North-West Territories from the continuous system of roads. The railway company is given the benefit of all the allowances, and only one acre in one hundred is to be reserved for trails. You may find, therefore, applied as extensively as this provision may be applied, provisions which in their terms would appear to me to be applicable only to ranching and grazing districts, and not at all to districts which are capable of being settled; I do not mean those districts which are now used as ranching and grazing districts, for I am told of many of them it is said they are quite capable of being settled; and therefore I go beyond those districts which are now used for ranching and grazing, and I say that, instead of this being confined to these lands, it is extended to lands which are suitable for agricultural settlement. Well, if it be an advantage, if it be in the public interest that lands which are susceptible of being settled in the ordinary way in the North-West should be utilised by abolishing the system of the road allowances and granting the road allowances to a private corporation, substituting only a reservation for trails, I want to know why it is not adopted generally, why it is good for the blocks of land granted to the railway company and not for the general public? But you do not propose to extend it generally, and therefore you acknowledge that it is not good for the general public, and, if it is not, it should not be done to benefit the railway company. These observations occurred to me, and it is possible some of them may have been explained by the hon. gentleman and the force of them removed during my unavoidable absence from the House, but, not having heard such explanations, I thought it was not right that the Bill should pass without having ventured to submit them.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As to the first objection of the hon. gentleman, that with regard to the Hudson's Bay Company's sections, if I understand the Bill the provision is that the Hudson's Bay Company shall be consenting parties to the grant of a whole township in lieu of the sections they are entitled to. Under the existing law, they take substantially two sections out of each township. Under the particular case through which this arose, the railway ordinarily known as the Galt Railway, running from Dunmore to Lethbridge, they are consenting parties to it, and have agreed to take

Mr. BLAKE.

their lands in a distinct block. So much for that principle in regard to the Hudson's Bay sections. Then, with regard to the other suggestion of the hon. gentleman, the particular district through which this railway runs is peculiarly adapted for ranching purposes, and the railway company desire to use it for ranching purposes in the meantime, and I believe they are proposing to lease their lands for those purposes at the same rate as the Government are leasing their lands, that is at 2 cents an acre, so that ranchmen who choose to get their lands from the Government may have the adjoining lands also from the company. The road allowance belongs to them in that way, reserving the right for tracks; but, if the land is fit for settlement, it is clear that it would be more valuable to a railway company of that kind to have settlers there than to have ranchmen; and, inasmuch as the survey has been made, which is not at all altered by the proposal now made, they have their road allowances if they choose to use them, and I think the company may be safely trusted to look after their own interests in that matter. So far as the alternate blocks belonging to the Government are concerned, there is no interference with them. They are reserved for settlement in the usual way, if settlers choose to go upon them.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; but does not the hon. gentleman see that if there be a township belonging to the public on which there are ordinary settlers, and then a railway company's block, and then another township with settlers beyond, the means of communication to the settlers in the two townships are going to be seriously interfered with if only a trail is to be reserved for the purposes of driving and watering cattle, instead of the present highway arrangements.

Mr. MILLS. I do not see why there should be a provision of this sort at all. The Hudson's Bay Company are entitled to one-twentieth of the lands in the North-West set out for settlement for fifty years—that is, up to the year 1920. If lands are set out for settlement after that period they will not be entitled to share in them. By a subsequent arrangement with the company, to which they assented at the time the first Dominion Lands Act was carried, they agreed to take certain specific sections in each township set out for settlement, two sections in most of the townships. I do not see why the hon. gentleman wants to interfere with that arrangement at all. Suppose a township is reserved for a railway company, that you grant alternate townships instead of alternate sections, the company would take those townships, subject to the deduction of the school lands and the lands which are set out to which the Hudson's Bay Company would be entitled, just the same as if no special provision was made on the subject. The hon. gentleman will find this to be the case by making a provision of this sort in the Bill, that he enormously increases the difficulty of administration. If the law is allowed to operate, the railway company know, when they receive a particular township, that there are two sections to come out of that township for the Hudson's Bay Company and two others that are reserved for school purposes. They go on these sections, and the moment the township is subdivided and set out for settlement, the company take thirty-two out of thirty-six sections. The quarter-sections are reserved in this particular way. Now, if the hon. gentleman proposes to provide that the whole township may pass to the railway company, and that the Hudson's Bay Company may be satisfied with lands given elsewhere, he will find that in every instance the company will insist on having lands which are at least as good as those which they have surrendered to the Government for the use of the railway company that is to receive a particular township, and there will always be a difficulty in satisfying the company that the lands you propose to give them elsewhere are of equal value