

Kettle River Valley Railway Bill through the Railway Committee is looked upon as ominous for this section of the country. It is hoped that the Canadian Pacific Railway will be able to come to the rescue and prevent the farmers of the Colliville Valley, Washington, supply the Boundary Creek district, as must follow the construction of an unopposed line into that territory from the United States.

Kaslo, B.C., April 1.—The Kettle River Railway Bill has created no interest to speak of here, until to-day's despatch reporting Mr. Corbin's victory before the Railway Committee over Sir William C. Van Horne and Mr. Shaughnessy, became known. Those who know the Boundary district are of one voice as to the need of a railway in that section. The feeling seems to prevail that a line from the United States would prove most injurious to the general interests of the country, and should only be permitted in the event of it not being possible to arrange for the construction of a Canadian line through that district.

Sir, if it should turn out that competition is necessary, by shutting out this line now we do not preclude ourselves from the option of near competition or ultimate competition. If it should appear that those clauses which were put into the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill last year for the purpose of enabling the Government to control the freight rates on every line of the Canadian Pacific Railway which communicates by any route with the Crow's Nest Pass road, which means the whole line practically, are delusive, which they are not—if it is found that they are insufficient to do what I hold is the true policy, to control these lines by Government surveillance and Government control, then we do not surrender our option of obtaining this company, and we may be perfectly certain here will be persons always ready to come in and build a line. It is a departure from the policy of last year; it is contrary to the policy of Canada for the Canadians; it is a retrograde step, and is one which should not be made with the approval of this House. Some hon. members may say: did not this Bill pass the Railway Committee? How did it pass the Railway Committee? With a majority of only six, when a large number, or at all events a considerable number of hon. members opposed to it were absent; and when it is a large national question such as this, is it to be supposed for one moment that we are to be controlled by the mere pedantry that the Bill passed the Railway Committee and should thereby be led not to revise or review the issue here? Let me say to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) that I do not want to place anyone at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. No one is at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway now with the Act of last session in our hands; and if the people are at the company's mercy, the Government should exercise the power given them by that Act. My hon. friend has spoken of the anxiety of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What about the country

through which the Canadian Pacific Railway goes? It runs through Manitoba, Assiniboia and Alberta. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that that part of Canada is not anxious for the trade of Boundary Creek? I can understand that a great railway makes many enemies, as in fact every railroad does. The Grand Trunk did so in the past, and no doubt has many enemies now. The Canadian Pacific Railway made many enemies in the past, and the fact was not surprising; but the mere circumstance that it may be popular to cry out against the great railway corporations is no reason why, when an issue like this comes before Parliament we should allow our eyes to be blinded and should not consider the question in a judicial frame of mind. Taking the circumstances of the North-west into account, considering the circumstances of Assiniboia, Alberta, the Saskatchewan and Manitoba together with the interests of British Columbia, we should decide whether the best course to adopt is not to prevent this road going through.

Mr. BOSTOCK. I desire to make a few remarks in answer to what has been said in the committee by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes). The hon. gentleman occupied a large portion of the afternoon in placing before the committee the same arguments that had been used before the Railway Committee as to why this Bill should not pass, and he travelled over very much the same ground as was traversed on that occasion. One strong point which I wish to bring before hon. members constitutes a very good answer to what has been said by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in regard to the stand that I took when speaking about the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. At that time I explained the geographical conditions of the country, and pointed to the fact that the mountain ranges in British Columbia run in such a direction that trade would pass down into the United States to the south; but on this occasion that fact is one of the strongest reasons why I am in favour of the present Bill, for we have the geographical conditions with us. The Kettle River, as any one who has studied the map knows, winds in and out of the boundary line, and runs into the Columbia below Northport. The streams running north from the mountain to the south of the boundary line enter Washington Territory; and one of the strong reasons why, from the point of view of British Columbia and the constituency which I represent, I favour the measure is, that by allowing this railway to be built in British Columbia, on the line laid down by the present charter, it will tend to draw the ores from the Eureka country in Washington Territory and from the mountains around which the Kettle River runs into British Columbia. If this charter be not granted, the railway, which can be built by Mr. Corbin without being in