

going to say, an agitation for the purpose of preventing Americans from holding claims in that country. At the present time Americans are able to go into the Boundary Creek country or the Kootenay country, and stake out claims there in competition with British and Canadian subjects; and they can then go across the line to the south which is, so far as one can tell, almost as rich a mineral country as that which we have on the north side of the boundary line, and they can stake out claims there. The consequence is that they are able to hold and develop claims on both sides of the line, or on whichever side they think most advantageous. But a British subject going into that country can only take up a claim in British Columbia. He is handicapped to this extent, that if he should happen to go across the boundary line, as it is possible for a man to do without knowing it, he might take up a claim on American territory, and then find out that he could not hold it because he was a British subject. But up to the present time, if a man is an American citizen it does not matter on which side of the line he operates. Therefore, I say that hon. gentlemen who are opposing this Bill on the ground of putting money and trade into the pockets of our neighbours on the south side of the boundary line, would be doing much better service if they would take up this question from what I may call the foundation, and say that they are prepared to prevent Americans from holding mineral claims on our side of the line. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to detain this committee any longer, but I hope that they will seriously consider this matter and will not vote against what I consider the best interests of the miners and of the mining interests of British Columbia.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I had expected that we would enjoy the advantage of hearing some of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Certainly it does seem to me that we were entitled ere this to know what they would say, if this subject is so important as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Bostock) thinks it is, and if the hon. gentleman from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) is also right in attributing to the measure so great an importance as he did this afternoon. For myself I would have been particularly glad to hear from those hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches who have been pointedly referred to in this debate, whose utterances have been mentioned several times, utterances made last session when the Government were asking for a very large amount, some four million dollars, in aid of the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass road. These statements are serious, they are of very great importance, and particularly so because they are directly in line with the policy of the British Columbia legislature as expressed in the resolution which was read

Mr. BOSTOCK.

in this debate. The hon. gentleman who has taken his seat also shared those views last session. His observations on the general principle were brought to his notice to-day, and in listening very attentively to him I failed to hear from him any explanation of the views he held then as compared with the views that he expresses now. It does not seem to me that the hon. gentleman can hold the same view that he held on that important occasion, and advocate the adoption of this Bill. The hon. gentleman, it is true, endeavoured to get rid of some of the statements from the localities so far as they were attributed to newspaper correspondents. But in that part of his argument it is important to observe that he was unable to deal at all with one of the important communications that the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) read to the House in which the "Northport," a paper published in Washington Territory, confirmed, so far as the expression of the opinion of a paper on a subject like this can confirm, the views of those hon. gentlemen who are of the same opinion as the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Trade and Commerce were last session. The hon. gentleman overlooked, I say, this rejoicing on the part of the "Northport" at the announcement that the Railway Committee had reported in favour of this Kettle River Valley Railway charter. This is what it said: "Now look out for great prosperity for Northport." The view they take is the view of the hon. gentleman then, as it seems to me, so well expressed last session and concurred in by this House. Therefore, whether we are right or wrong in attributing to those observations the great importance attached to them as coming from Cabinet Ministers during the discussion of a very large grant and in advocacy of that grant—whether, I say, we are right or wrong in attributing importance to them, it does seem to me that the duty devolves on hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to deal with the subject, and harmonize, if they can, the position of the Minister of Railways and Canals, at any rate, in regard to this measure. The hon. gentleman is said to have spoken in the Railway Committee, and being a Minister of the Crown, of course his observations must have had great weight there. It would be fair to this Committee of the Whole House that it should have any advantage that might attach to his observations made in another place. Hon. gentlemen, all through this debate, have been referring to the discussions that took place in the Railway Committee; they have done so, contrary to the rules of the House, but apparently with the consent of this committee. Yet no one would pretend that hon. gentlemen have given accurately, that is fully, the various arguments used before that committee. I should like to understand, too, in connection with the apparent change of position taken by the Minister of Railways, whether the Minister of Trade and Commerce has