

part of this Parliament. I am not at all overcome by the attack which the "Globe" has made upon me, feeling that I have simply done my duty in this matter. I say again, Sir, that it is only because further silence on my part might be construed into an acknowledgment that I had misstated facts, that I wish to call your attention briefly to the statements I made, and to give you some reasons which I think will amply justify every statement that I have made.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McInnes) stated that he rose to a question of privilege. In that case, the hon. gentleman will understand that he should conclude with a motion, but if the hon. gentleman rises to a question of personal explanation, that is a different thing. The hon. gentleman himself stated that he rose to a question of privilege. May I ask, is it a personal explanation or a question of privilege.

Mr. McINNES. Mr. Speaker, I am not sufficiently familiar with the rules of this House to know exactly what I should do, but I certainly wish to have an opportunity afforded me of showing that the remarks which I made in my speech of Monday last were absolutely warranted.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is making a personal explanation he can proceed. I merely wish to have it in proper parliamentary form.

Mr. McINNES. Then, Sir, I rise to make a personal explanation. I said, among other things, on Monday last :

I have no hesitation in saying that from the time, some months ago, when they took up this matter with extraordinary, sudden and intense interest, their attitude has been characterized by cant and deception.

There can be no doubt about it, Sir, that the "Globe" did take this matter up with a sudden, extraordinary and intense interest at the start. Why, Sir, it surprised people in eastern Canada to see the "Globe" taking such an interest in this undertaking. It was a new scheme to the people of the east. No person in the east seemed interested in it five or six months ago ; but notwithstanding that fact, the "Globe" came out in the early part of November of last year and dealt with this matter editorially. It published strong editorials day after day and week after week, and it has continued that course up to the present time. We did not know at that time what was the reason for that sudden and intense interest ; we had no clue ; but I am going to show that subsequent events proved that there was a very good motive, from its standpoint, for the "Globe" dealing with this matter with such intense interest. I say that its attitude has been characterized by cant and the grossest deception. It is not my purpose to go through the files of the "Globe" to show that this has been so. Time will

Mr. McINNES.

not permit, but no person can look through the files of that paper without coming to that conclusion. A case has occurred, however, in the past week which I think will show hon. gentlemen that there is ample justification for the statement I make. In its issue of April 1st, dealing with this matter, the "Globe," amongst other things, has this to say editorially :

Whatever it may have parted with, it, the province, retains royalties, which will enable it to reap a considerable benefit from the working of the mineral resources of the country. It is estimated that the 5-cent royalty on coal would yield in the Crow's Nest Pass region \$1,248,800 per square mile, or \$179,827,200 in all, the area being estimated at 144 square miles.

In the issue of April 7th, the "Globe" reverts to the same argument, and after quoting my figures with regard to the enormous amount of coal in that coal basin, it says :

Whichever price we take, we know that the provincial royalty on coal is 5 cents a ton, and this, on the second estimate quoted by Mr. McInnes, would give a total royalty of nearly two billion dollars to the province, whose railways we are asked to build ! Figuring on the more moderate estimate of the Geological Survey, Mr. Elias Rogers estimates that the royalties coming to the province will aggregate \$179,827,200. For the Dominion to build the road while the province receives all the revenues by way of royalty or taxation is, we think, out of the question, and it is chiefly upon this ground that we oppose a disallowance which is evidently sought merely as a step towards Government construction.

This statement is absolutely incorrect, and it comes either from designed deception or from an ignorance which is inexcusable in regard to this matter. The province has not retained the right to collect any royalty at all on coal in the lands alienated to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. It is true, in the case of lands taken up under the British Columbia Land Act, the coal, should there be coal, is reserved to the Crown, with the right of the Crown to exact a royalty from it, when worked, of 5 cents a ton. That provision applies only to such lands as are taken up under the Land Act of the province. There is not a scintilla of truth in this statement in the "Globe," which has been reiterated on several occasions, that the province still holds the right to place a royalty of 5 cents a ton on the coal which has been alienated to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. It may be said that the province has the right to tax anything in the province. Undoubtedly it has ; but it could never and would never put a tax upon that coal, for this reason, that if it now imposed and exacted a royalty on the coal worked in that region, it would have to exact a royalty on the coal now worked in the province, and the unfortunate fact is that the coal trade in British Columbia will not at the present time stand any