

stated in the committees of this House by his fellow members of this House, that these documents will certainly make the Government hesitate a long time before they will grant public lands to a company presided over by that hon. gentleman.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I quite appreciate the wisdom of the hon. gentleman in saying at the outset of his remarks that there was nothing in these affidavits affecting me. What these men may have said or may not have said is a matter of little consequence; but I am bound to say that I would require better testimony than the oath of either of them, one the employee of the other, before believing any statement they made with regard to any hon. gentleman in this House.

Mr. BLAKE. With regard to this clause, it was understood that the hon. gentleman would explain what steps the Government were going to take in fulfilment of the pledge made in the Railway Committee.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I intend to move a clause giving power to incorporate a company to carry out this work.

On section 5,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I beg leave to move the following as the 5th clause of the Bill:—

And whereas it may be necessary for the construction of the railway in respect of which the granting of a subsidy is authorised by the second section of this Act, that a company should be incorporated with the powers requisite for such construction, and for making financial arrangements for the purposes thereof; therefore it is hereby enacted as follows:

For the purpose of incorporating the persons undertaking the construction of the said railway, or of a railway from a point on the Manitoba and North-Western *via* Rapid City, westward, and for the incorporation of those who shall be associated with them in the undertaking; the Governor in Council may grant to them, under such corporate name as he shall deem expedient, a charter conferring upon them the franchises, privileges and powers requisite for the said purposes, which shall be similar to such of the franchises, privileges and powers granted to railway companies during the present Session, as the Government shall deem most useful or appropriate to the said undertaking; and such charter, being published in the *Canada Gazette* with any Order or Orders in Council relating to it, shall have force and effect as if it were an Act of Parliament: Provided always that in the event of a company being so incorporated, it shall be provided in the charter that such company shall be subject to all the present legal obligations of the North-West Central Railway Company in relation to the said railway.

That proviso was put in to protect the interests of the people who have been working on the road.

Mr. BLAKE. I would merely say that I repeat the observations I made, with reference to the exceptional character of this legislation, on the Bill which preceded this one. I think it would have been better to have introduced a separate Bill, and I think the legislation is in itself of an objectionable character.

Mr. WATSON. Can the company, under these powers, start the road from any other point than Brandon?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not know. I fancy if they can supply that section of country in any other way, and cannot get a company immediately to go through Brandon, we would be consulting the interests of the country by incorporating a company to cover the ground. The great object is, of course, to give railway facilities to the people of that district.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but they may be restricted, because the Bill mentions "a railway for the whole distance from Brandon to Battleford."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, of course, if a new company were incorporated it would be incorporated in the lines of this one. But if we fail to make arrangements with a company, and the Manitoba and North-Western have a charter which would enable them to do the work, we might give that company the grant.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think, under this clause, it would be competent for the hon. gentleman to give to any other

Mr. EDGAR.

railway company a grant for any other railway than a line from Brandon to Battleford. That is the clear interpretation of the clause, so that if the hon. gentleman wants more powers, he had better take them.

Mr. HESSON. A railway from Brandon is exactly what is required, and I am surprised that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) should object to having a provision for starting the road from that point. It will serve that part of the country, which has petitioned for railway accommodation. I have been over the ground and I know every rod of it, and I hope the Government will adhere to that provision.

Mr. WATSON. If some provision were inserted in this Bill giving the Government power to make this land grant to a company that would afford railway facilities to Rapid City and to the country west of that point, it would be satisfactory. I want to see the road built; but clause 2 of this Bill does not authorise the Government to give a land grant to any company except a company building from Brandon. If that company should fail, and it should be impossible to get another company, I believe the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company are prepared to build this road.

Mr. MITCHELL. The objection I have to this section of the Bill is this: We have had a great deal of discussion in relation to this North-West Central Railway Company and the parties who have been promoting it in this House. There has been a great deal of discussion in the press and throughout the country about it, and it has aroused a great deal of unpleasant feeling in the public mind. The decision of the Government was to put through the Bill, and allow the promoters until the 1st day of June to place in the hands of the Government such assurance as would satisfy them that they were prepared *bona fide* to carry out the work. We are informed by the Minister of the Interior that those assurances meant a deposit of \$50,000. Now, Sir, this is the evening of the last day on which those gentlemen had the privilege of depositing that money with the Government, and it strikes me as very singular that we should provide in the second section of this Bill:

"The Governor in Council may grant to the North-West Central Railway Company or to such other company as may undertake the construction of the railway, Dominion lands to the extent of 6,400 acres for each mile of the company's railway."

Why should we grant a land subsidy to a company which is practically defunct? I think it would be giving an endorsement to the course pursued in relation to this matter, and therefore I most decidedly object to that section of the Bill. I want to see the bonus given for the purpose of having that road built; I want it put into hands that are clean, and that the public is satisfied are able to build the work. But after the exposures which have been made, I do not want to see an Act of Parliament passed granting 6,400 acres a mile to that very company, and I think the Government should alter that clause or let it stand till this evening, in order to see whether the money has been paid up or not.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will see that the Bill cannot take its third reading to-day, and by to-morrow we shall know whether the money has been paid or not; and then, if it has not been paid, we can strike out the provision making a grant to the North-West Central Railway Company, because then it will be at an end.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think these words inserted after the words "company's railway," would probably meet the case: "Or a railway along the same route from Rapid City westward, but with different termini from those provided in relation to the railway hereinbefore referred to and for the incorporation of those associated with them in the undertaking."

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman explain the object of saying different termini? Does he propose to alter