

nels before we give opportunities to the people of the United States to get in there. There is nothing to be lost by refusing this charter. That country will get the same accommodation from the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Railway. There is no doubt about that. The Canadian Pacific Railway have stated, and no person has denied, that they will build in there without a subsidy. There is no point of preference, therefore, as to time or the granting of a subsidy which would make you prefer the granting of a charter to an American road as against our Canadian road. There is absolutely no point of preference for the American road as against the Canadian road. That being so, I appeal to this House to give the preference which a Canadian road has a right to expect from a Canadian Parliament. We do not tie up the country by so doing.

For one year from now, ten years from now, any time this Parliament wishes in future to grant a charter to Mr. Corbin or any other United States railway magnate, there is nothing to hinder it, we do not tie our hands at all, we are absolutely free in the future in that respect. But I wish again to point out this fact, that this road, if built by a Canadian company, will not only conserve the trade of that section to British Columbia and to eastern Canada, but it will do something that Mr. Corbin's road will not do, it will develop that country to an extent four times as much. You who were in the Railway Committee and saw that peculiar map they had displayed on the wall, must have been struck with the fact that Mr. Corbin seeks to build only about thirty or forty miles in British Columbia, in Canadian territory. If the Canadian line is built, it will be built altogether in Canadian territory, and will extend this year alone something like 150 miles. That in itself, I submit, is a consideration which should throw the favour of this House on the side of the Canadian company. But after all is said and done, even if the American company should open up that country to the same extent as the Canadian company, I say it is the part of wisdom and of prudence for us at this time, when that trade is just beginning to get into settled channels, to refuse a charter to the American road and let our own Canadian road have the preference.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not wish to say anything on the main point, but simply to refer to the question at issue between the hon. gentleman and myself. I take it that neither of us have any other knowledge of how this vote went than that furnished by the material before us here. Now, the first vote was taken on the 23rd day of March. On the 24th of March, the Vancouver "World," which is the strongest supporter of the local government in that province, had the following paragraph re-

Mr. McINNES.

ferring to that vote, which appears in the Votes and Proceedings :

Let it be known far and near that those who are desirous of giving away the natural wealth which this province possesses, and the people's inheritance, are the Opposition, with the solitary exception of Mr. A. Williams, senior member for this city, who rose above partyism, and preferring country to faction, voted with the Government on this question, and in the best interests of Vancouver and the province generally.

That was on the 24th, the vote having been taken on the evening of the 23rd. Now, I find in the Vancouver "World" of the 26th, this paragraph :

It now appears that we were in error in stating the other day that Mr. Williams had voted with the majority in the House on Mr. Helmcken's resolution urging the Dominion Government to withhold its sanction for granting a charter to D. C. Corbin for the extension of the Spokane and Northern railroad from Marcus into the Boundary Creek country, and concerning which there is considerable feeling on the coast, in the interior and elsewhere in the Dominion.

That was three days after the vote, and therefore they must have seen occasion to retract the first statement as having been erroneous. If there is a strong supporter of the local government, it is the Vancouver "World," and a most excellent paper it is. Now, when you read the Votes and Proceedings in connection with this, I am bound to take the statement of Mr. McLagan, the editor of the Vancouver "World," that Mr. Williams did not vote as it appeared at first that he had voted. What are the facts? The main motion was put, as we heard read by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), and to that motion an amendment was moved by Mr. Semlin, leader of the Opposition, and for that amendment voted every man of the Opposition, Mr. Williams included. Of course, it was voted down. Then, on the resumption of the debate next day, a member moved the previous question, and all the government members voted for it, and all the opposition, including Mr. Williams, voted against it. Then the original question was put and carried. Now, you will observe that Mr. Williams, who is a strong supporter of the opposition, in fact an indispensable factor of the opposition, at every previous stage of this question voted with the opposition. Then, why should he turn around again and, after voting for the amendment and against the previous question, when it comes to the main question, take a directly contrary course? On the 26th, after, no doubt, Mr. Williams having sought a correction, the "World" stated that it was in error in its first statement that Mr. Williams had voted with the majority. I think I am justified in saying that must have been a misprint, it must have been an error. It is quite inexplicable to me, knowing Mr. Williams as I do and his status in the opposition, that he would vote for