

taken when the resolution was moved asking the legislature to make representations to the Dominion Government with a view to prevent this charter being granted by the Dominion Parliament. There was not a direct negative vote taken. The motion was a motion to defer consideration, and that motion would, in itself, suggest great caution in overriding the wishes, not only of the boards of trade on the coast, but of the legislature itself. The speech delivered by Mr. Semlin is reported in the "Daily Colonist," of Victoria, and, as it is comparatively short and has not been quoted during this discussion, I will read it :

Mr. Semlin was not sufficiently acquainted with the Boundary country to make up his mind at once on the subject. He, and he supposed all the members, had at heart the best interests of Canada. A railway was not a patriotic institution, but a business enterprise. The Canadian Pacific Railway was built for business purposes. When they wanted to shut off an opponent they raised the patriotic cry, but they were in their business actuated by their own best interests.

He was not at all in love with Mr. Corbin or his railway actions hitherto. Mr. Corbin was not actuated by sentiment in his railway enterprises any more than the Canadian Pacific Railway. He wanted to make money and so did the Canadian Pacific Railway. The ground Mr. Graham had taken was that railway competition was best for the people of the district of which he spoke. He would, however, like to be better informed as to the condition of things in the Boundary Creek country, and he was of opinion a committee should be formed to make inquiries and report to this House. He moved that the question be referred to a select committee of inquiry. The committee to be composed of Messrs. Rithet, Graham, Higgins, Stoddart and Hume.

The Premier said : There was a certainty of a railway going in there this summer from this side of the line, a line that would be much better than the one under discussion. He referred to the line from Penticton, a line that would connect with the Shuswap and Okanagan and make that railway, in which the province had an interest, and which was costing largely every year, a paying line.

Hon. Mr. Baker said : There could not be a doubt that the Corbin road would carry the ore out of the country to the American side, and the trade would go south instead of being kept in British Columbia. If they voted against the resolution they could not take a more effective way of injuring the business interests of the province.

Hon. Mr. Eberts said : The road from Penticton would be a great help to the province, and put the Shuswap and Okanagan road on a paying basis. For his part, he believed in taking care of ourselves first, and not going against our own province in favour of American roads. The Penticton road, they might be quite sure, would start before next August, as they had to do so in order to hold their charter and get their subsidy. He had nothing to say against Mr. Corbin, who was a most estimable man, but the whole question was whether it was better to allow a road to be built from the United States side or to have a British Columbia road.

The reference to that debate in the British Columbia legislature is, I think, very important, for we must consider the opinion

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

of the British Columbia legislature just as much as any action of this House would be taken to be the expression of opinion of this body. We have from the legislature of British Columbia and from the different boards of trade, overwhelming representations to impress upon this House that in the interests of the trade of British Columbia, and in the interest of the trade of Canada as done in British Columbia, it would be against good policy to grant such a charter as this. I was rather struck by the argument advanced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bostock) who tried to make out that we in this House should take the opinion of his electors—even supposing he does represent the opinion of the majority in his constituency on this question—against the opinion of the local legislature. Now, the legislature of British Columbia has to do with granting of railway charters in that province and it is but a weak argument to advance in this House, that in a certain district of that province there is a public sentiment against the decision of the local legislature. In considering this measure we cannot attach too much importance to the opinion of the local legislature, because we must remember that there was a time when hon. gentlemen opposite paid the greatest possible respect to the expression of provincial opinion and to provincial rights. It must be remembered that it is on account of a very slight circumstance that we are dealing with this Bill in any shape or form in this Parliament. It is a Bill authorizing the construction of a very few miles of railway in British Columbia, and it is merely owing to the fact that this short line of road connects with the international boundary that it has to come before the Federal Parliament at all. If this railway were a great deal longer than it is, but did not connect with the international boundary, then the British Columbia legislature would have the matter completely within their own power. Therefore, I say that if hon. gentlemen opposite have regard to their past record they will think very seriously before interfering with even the slightest semblance of what they used to consider a provincial right. I have already dealt with the observations made last year by some hon. gentlemen opposite and which are entirely inconsistent with the arguments that they have made this session. I am not going out of my way to attribute any very great importance to their utterances ; but I have no hesitation in saying that these gentlemen opposite struck a popular note in the country last year when they based their policy in regard to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway on this principle. Acting on that principle which was adopted by Parliament last year, I shall exercise my privilege of voting against the adoption of this Bill.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Within my recollection no railway Bill has ever received