

well along in construction. The Dominion Government had the matter still under its consideration, however, and there was every reason to believe that the negotiations would yet have a satisfactory conclusion if the grant were permitted to remain on the statute book. That was if the Province of British Columbia did not adopt the policy of repudiating the contract to which the Attorney-General had referred would become perfectly good and valid as soon as the Dominion gave its supplementing assistance. The subject was of the greatest interest to all the people of British Columbia, and all would hail with gladness the construction of the road. The position of affairs with regard to the northern line to Teslin Lake was very similar. The assurance had been given by a Dominion Minister that if the Province gave this assistance the Dominion would contribute yet more liberally.

HON. MR. SEMLIN—"Which Minister?"

MR. TURNER did not answer, whereupon

MR. MARTIN said—"Has the honorable gentleman any objection to saying which Minister?"

MR. TURNER said he did not think it was necessary and he thought Mr. Martin would believe him in the matter.

MR. MARTIN—"I don't know anything about it; it is the first I have heard of it."

MR. TURNER, continuing, said that as to the other lines interested in the subsidies that it was proposed to repeal—their promoters had been put to considerable expense and were yet persevering in their endeavors to put their projects through. If their subsidies were revoked the chances of the Province gaining these useful roads would be killed. One of these roads might Province gaining these useful roads would be killed. One of these roads he might specially refer to—the Ashcroft & Cariboo—on which he knew the promoters several projects through. If their subsidies were revoked the chances of the were working at the present time. Should this Bill pass their project would undoubtedly be killed. The passage of this Bill would go far toward preventing the development of British Columbia by railway construction, and taking all these matters into consideration he could not give his vote for the second reading of this measure, which could not but be accepted as a measure of repudiation on the part of the Province of British Columbia.

MR. EBERTS thought this bill of which the Attorney-General had moved the second reading the most wonderful piece of legislation that had ever been brought before the legislature of any province by its Attorney-General. The very first section proposed to take away the grant that a company had actually earned by constructing the road through the Crow's Nest Pass in accordance with a contract made with the government—a contract carried out in perfect faith. That such repudiation was even contemplated was calculated to disturb the confidence of capitalists in British Columbia to a most prejudicial extent. And now the Attorney-General came forward blandly and once more said it was simply a mistake. Such very important mistakes appeared to be occurring in all that honorable gentleman's legislation. There had been such a mistake in the Provincial Elections bill. There had been such mistakes in one or two other measures since. As soon as it was apparent that the government was going beyond the limits of what the people would put up with, the most objectionable feature was quietly withdrawn. It was merely a mistake. On the present occasion he felt bound to agree with the Attorney-General—the whole bill was a mistake. Had it been a mistake he would ask, on the part of the late government to recognize the unbounded richness of the province whose destinies had been entrusted to their care, and its great mineral richness, and to inaugurate a policy having as its keynote the development of these vast resources. Had it been good policy to open up the Kootenay and the Slocan? Had it been good policy to develop a revenue of \$25,000 up to \$350,000, and that in a very short period indeed? Could this be said to be bad policy? The Attorney-General had said that the railway legislation which it was here proposed to repudiate had been devised with the object of catching votes at the late general election. How could this be when the acts referred to had been put upon the statute books eighteen months before an election was so much as thought of.

Hon. Mr. Martin (interrupting) observed that it was not the statutes that he had referred to, but the announcement of contracts.

Mr. Eberts continued that he would be able to show that the words of the Attorney-General here too were unjustifiable. Referring to the Boundary Creek and Pentiction road, it had been thought well in the last year of the legislature to accentuate the fact that the late government had laid down in railway promotion—that not a dollar should be paid until the road had been built and completed to the satisfaction of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.