

**Mr. MORRISON.** Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose it is of much consequence, but, as a matter of fact, Mr. Williams opposed it.

**Mr. McINNES.** Mr. Chairman, I do not like to be so categorically contradicted. I stated that I had in my hand the Votes and Proceedings of the legislative assembly of British Columbia, and if any one can speak with authority on this matter, I think we can speak with authority with that document before us, rather than with any newspaper report which my hon. friend may have seen to the contrary; and, Sir, I will read the names now, for my own vindication:

Original question proposed and carried on the following division:—Yeas: Messrs. Huff, Williams, Smith, Mutter, Helmcken, Baker, Turner, Martin, Rithet, Adams, Higgins, Stoddart, Walkem, Pooley, Eberts, Bryden, Rogers, Hunter, Braden, McGregor—20.

**Mr. Baker** is the representative of one of the Kootenays, the very district interested in this matter, and a member of the government, and is probably as familiar with the question as any man in this House or in that House. **Mr. Higgins** was Speaker of that legislature up to, I think, three weeks ago. He resigned, presumably because he could not agree with the government. He is considered in that province as an Oppositionist; and, more than that, he is a man who has very large interests in the very district which is sought to be traversed by this proposed railway. I understand that he is one of the largest owners of real estate in Grand Forks; and, if there is a man in that House who stood to gain enormously by the building of a railway through that section, it was **Mr. Higgins**.

Nays: Messrs. Sword, Kennedy, Hume, Forster, Macpherson, Kidd, Vedder, Semlin, Cotton, Graham—10.

**Mr. BERGERON.** What about Williams?

**Mr. McINNES.** He supported the proposition.

**Mr. WALLACE.** What about the statement of the hon. member for Westminster (**Mr. Morrison**)? What is he going to say?

**Mr. McINNES.** He may make his statement if he wishes.

**Mr. BERGERON.** He ought to take it back.

**Mr. McINNES.** I make this assertion. Not only did that resolution pass by a large majority of two to one in the British Columbia legislature, but if all the facts were known then as they are to-day, it would have passed unanimously. I can prove that assertion. One of the brainiest and ablest men on the Opposition side of that House, and one who, should a change take place, will undoubtedly be a member of the new Government, is **Mr. Cotton**, who represents Vancouver City. He also is editor of the

“**News Advertiser**,” of Vancouver, and in discussing editorially the vote that took place in the legislature the day before, he wrote as follows:—

The Opposition laid down the proposition that the interests of Boundary Creek district, and also of those of the province at large, required the immediate construction of a railway connecting that district either with the Canadian Pacific Railway or the American railway systems. Having stated that first proposition—the necessity of immediate railway construction—the Opposition expressed just as clearly its opinion—

**Mark this, Mr. Speaker:**

—that connection with the Canadian railway was, from a provincial standpoint of view, preferable to one with the American system of railways. It, therefore, earnestly asked the Government to either give the House such information as would show that if **Mr. Corbin** was refused the charter, the Canadian Pacific Railway would build a line at once, or give an assurance that such would be the case.

The Opposition would therefore have supported the resolution then if they had known that the Canadian Pacific Railway were ready to build a road.

Then the Opposition stated it could support the resolution asking the Dominion Government to refuse a charter to **Mr. Corbin**, without any fear that such action on its part might postpone the possibility of railway communication with Boundary Creek another year.

No one will deny that this was a wise and proper course for the Opposition to take, one, too, which the Government, if it was honest in its intentions, should have no hesitancy in meeting, by giving the desired assurance. But the Government did nothing of the kind. On the contrary, it absolutely refused to give any assurance that the construction of a line to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway would be immediately commenced if **Mr. Corbin's** request for a charter was refused.

I think we may fairly assume, in view of that statement and considering the position of the gentleman who makes it, that the legislature of British Columbia is unanimous in the sentiment expressed in the resolution which they passed.

I have here the “**Rossland Miner**,” which is the most important and influential journal in that part of British Columbia; and to show you that the feeling there is not what it has been represented to be, I will quote some portions of an editorial in the last issue of that paper which has come to hand, which will show you clearly that the feeling up there, as in the rest of British Columbia, is in favour of retaining the interests of that country for our own people:

By the granting of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway subsidy, the Dominion Government gained control of the Canadian Pacific Railway traffic rates in British Columbia, and it was also stipulated that, in all its extensions built subsequent to the granting of the subsidy, the Canadian Pacific Railway should not enjoy a monopoly of routes. It will thus be seen that the building the Canadian Pacific Railway from Rob-