

nections of which were wholly to the south of the boundary line. We had no Canadian road into that country then, but we had what we may distinctly call an American railway; a railway whose interests were American, whose ownership was American, and whose connections were with a system entirely and exclusively American. Last year we never heard of their having any traffic alliance or any other kind of alliance with the Grand Trunk Railway system of Canada; not a syllable was said with respect to that, so that I presume it was not then a fact. Last year we had in this part of southern British Columbia, no Canadian railroad which was capable of securing that traffic, but we had, on the other hand, a road from the south which had secured the traffic of that country and was carrying it to the States. Why, Sir, the case is practically the reverse of that of today. We have in that country now a Canadian railway, and we have it affirmed in the most emphatic manner by the president and vice-president of that road that by this fall they will have their line extended into this very Boundary Creek. Therefore, we are in possession now by and through a Canadian road; we are in possession from a Canadian railway point of view, I may say, practically of the Boundary Creek country.

Being in that position we are now asked the question: Shall we allow any other railway that happens to have connections to the south of the boundary line into that country, or shall we exclude it? Is not that a very different proposition from that of last year? That we should by all means force a road having Canadian connections and being Canadian, into a country which was then possessed solely by a railway, American in its ownership, in all its interests, and all its connections. It appears to me that it is practically impossible to state two propositions which are more directly opposite, the one from the other. I did not urge this House last year that we should not allow an American road to throw its connections into our country when that country was already possessed by one of our roads; and yet in order that I may be charged with inconsistency, it would be necessary that I should have taken that position last year. I did nothing of the kind. I am in favour—and I so stated to the committee as an individual member of this Parliament—I am in favour of allowing connections in from the south. I am in favour of it for many reasons; and if I had no other reason I should be in favour of it because of the special circumstances and conditions which exist in that Boundary Creek country. I stated in the committee the other day, and I ask indulgence while I repeat it again, that that country is full of low grade ore; it is full of a class of ore which may be profitably worked, which may be the foundation of one of the greatest series of mining camps we have in Can-

ada or any country in the world, providing you permit of all the conditions to concentrate in that country which will insure the cheap production and treatment of that ore. You will have to get all possible facilities there in order that its low grade ores may be turned to profitable account; and these ores cannot be turned to profitable account without causing an immense influx of population, which will vastly enhance the trade of the country. So far as I can form an opinion, the person who undertakes to say that he will not allow this railway or any other railway from the south to come into our country, is taking upon himself a very grave responsibility and one which I as an individual member of the House am not prepared to assume. I am not going to be intimidated into assuming a different attitude, because I am to be told, that in respect to a question before Parliament last year which involved entirely different considerations, I expressed the views which I then did. Mr. Speaker, this whole question has to my mind been sufficiently threshed out in this Parliament, and I think that every member probably has made up his mind as to what his vote is going to be. I merely rose for the purpose of stating that I have not expressed a different view this session from that which I expressed a year ago. If under the same circumstances the question came before Parliament now as it did last year, I would do exactly as I did then. I am glad to know, Sir, that an opportunity is now being afforded to the people to have their interests in that country safeguarded; I am glad to know that an opportunity is now open to them to obtain that railway competition which I am sure they would not obtain unless this railway entered their country. I am glad to know that the people of that district have now an opportunity of getting the facilities necessary for the successful prosecution of their valuable industry.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Chairman, I shall not answer the explanations given by the Minister of Railways as to how he came to stultify himself between last year and this year in the policy he thought proper to pursue on this railway question. I only wish to remind the committee that we are far from the object of the motion for the committee to rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again. The other day, when we were considering this Bill in committee, and when we had reached clause 6, the hon. Minister of Railways made this statement:

This clause was amended in the committee by reducing the capital stock from \$2,500,000 to \$1,000,000.

I then made the following statement:

As that does not appear in the Bill before the Committee, I think we had better get the committee to rise and report progress, and send the Bill back to the Committee on Railways.