

ed by the committee practically with a unanimous vote, all parties being agreed that the road should be constructed, and constructed on Canadian territory. What we were pressing for, and what we were justified in pressing for was that the company controlling this enterprise should be bound to build the road from the Similkameen valley to the coast on Canadian soil. Not only did we ask that, but we asked that a guarantee be put into the charter which would insure this construction on Canadian soil. And that was the strong point in dispute in the committee. As we know the committee was very evenly divided on that question, as to whether or not this guarantee should be taken in the Bill. We remember that when the vote was taken it stood 60 for and 60 against the resolution. Practically the resolution was carried, because one gentleman went into the committee room who was not a member of the committee and polled his vote against the resolution—and that gentleman a minister of the Crown. Had he not voted against the resolution, the resolution would have stood 60 for and 59 against. So that, practically, the resolution demanding a guarantee that the road should be constructed from Vancouver to Princeton on Canadian soil was carried in that committee. Unfortunately it was not until some days afterwards that it was detected that one gentleman had voted who was not a member of the committee. His vote stands to-day recorded against that resolution on which he had no right to vote.

Mr. RILEY. Was his name on the list and was it called by the clerk?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker, his name was on the list, and it was called by the clerk. But the hon. gentleman knew or ought to have known, that he was not a member of the committee. Now, I desire to make myself plain. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), when formerly a member of this House, was appointed a member of the Railway Committee. We all know that he ceased to be a member of this House when he accepted the portfolio of the Minister of the Interior. And, of course, when he ceased to be a member of this House, he ceased to be a member of the Railway Committee. And, never having been appointed again a member of that committee, he was not qualified to vote at this meeting at the time when this vote was taken. I think I make that plain. Now, to establish the fact, which I have stated, that we who voted for that amendment demanding that a guarantee be obtained from the railway company that they would build from the coast into Princeton before they crossed the boundary line—demanding in fact a guarantee that the road from the coast to Princeton should be considered on Canadian soil—I propose to read some articles from British Columbia papers, which, to my

mind, give the sentiments of the people of that province in a most straightforward and plain spoken way. Now, when I read these I think it will show that we who demand that that guarantee should be taken, were in harmony with the wishes of the people of British Columbia. I am going to read an article taken from the Vancouver 'Daily Province' of June 24, 1905.

Mr. D. ROSS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HENDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. D. ROSS. Is the hon. gentleman aware of the fact that the majority of the stock in the Vancouver Daily Province Publishing Company is owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not aware of it; I know nothing about it. And I do not think it makes any difference. I am going to read from a public journal, a journal which is read by the people of British Columbia and which, it seems to me, gives a most common-sense view of the full situation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. D. Ross) has asked me a question. I am not supposed to know who the stockholders of this newspaper are. I do not know what its political leanings are. I have not made any inquiries. It is not material to the case. The hon. gentleman (Mr. D. Ross) may know who are the shareholders, or it may be that what he says is only an insinuation as to the state of the case. Possibly he knows. If he does know he had better make a statement of the facts of the case. I fail to see any bearing it has on the question at issue and I think this House will come to the same conclusion when it listens to the article I now propose to read:

The Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Vote.

It is a matter which will be found to be not without interest to speculate on the nature of the explanations which will be given by the British Columbia members in the House of Commons in regard to their votes in the Railway Committee on the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Bill, when they come back to their constituents. Every one of the seven gentlemen who have been sent to Ottawa to guard the interests of this province in matters of federal legislation has voted in favour of granting the Great Northern Railway all the privileges it demands in the construction of its road in the Similkameen, and every one of them has voted against securing from that company any guarantee that it will build direct to a British Columbia port and not make one of the cities on Puget Sound its western terminus. Mr. R. G. Macpherson, the member for Vancouver, and Mr. J. B. Kennedy, the member for Westminster, have adopted the same attitude and voted in identically the same way as Mr. Duncan Ross, of Yale-Cariboo, who had charge of the Bill, and Mr. W. A. Galliher, the member for Kootenay. They not only have not asked that the assurances which ought to be obtained and which are invariably required by business men to secure the interests which they represent in