

competition to the extent I often hoped they would.

If we believe what the hon. Minister of Railways told us last year and what he has told us again this year with regard to this road and others, we are justified in the conclusion that the people will have as good freight rates and as good railway facilities in that section of the country at the end of the year if we do not grant the charter as they would if we do grant it, because the Canadian Pacific Railway will occupy that territory, and if we exercise proper control over their freight rates, the people there will have the advantage of railway communication and also of moderate rates. Will these freight rates be as favourable? I think they will. The control we exercise over them is a guarantee of that. Does the country require a railway in the interests of the miners to haul the raw material out of that country? We are sometimes told that it is absolutely necessary to take the ore across the line and to smelt it there. It is true that in that country they have been hauling out the products of the mines to a smelter in the United States at Northport, and we are told that were it not for the benefits afforded by the Corbin Railway, very little progress would have been made in that country. But we are also told that they have built up a very large and important town at Northport, and that it is built up by reason of the raw material taken from Canada, and when we are told by Mr. Corbin that the natural condition is such that in a short time these minerals must be smelted in British Columbia. It is not reasonable to contend that this railway is absolutely necessary in order to have the raw material taken out of the country and have it smelted in the United States. And if the Canadian Pacific Railway is passing through that country, as it will soon, the miners will be as well supplied by it as they would be by a railway coming from the United States.

I have been not a little amused and interested watching the Government in its attitude on this question. The Government is made up of a class of men who have heretofore been known all over the country as strong defenders of provincial rights. We have had election after election in Ontario in which their cry was provincial rights. The same has been the case in Manitoba and in other provinces from which we have obtained the heads of the various departments who, to a large extent, compose the Government of the present day. If these gentlemen were true to their convictions, or their expressed convictions in favour of provincial as against federal power, we might expect to find them arrayed in defence of the interests of the province against any other country or against the federal power. Now, as I understand it, British Columbia has spoken against giving this charter. In the course of this debate we have heard cited expressions of opinion of

boards of trade, of members of the legislature and resolutions passed by the legislature. These things justify us in saying in concluding that the province is against this charter. How, then, is it that these gentlemen who were such strong defenders of provincial rights are arrayed against that province? When Manitoba was fighting against the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway, none more strongly upheld provincial rights than those who are defending the granting of this charter. I would like to ask these hon. gentlemen, whether if the province of Ontario spoke as a province against a charter being given to a certain railway within the province, if it was declared by the legislative assembly that such a charter would be detrimental to the province, would they be found opposing the opinions of Ontario as they do now those of British Columbia? Or if the case were in Manitoba or in Quebec or Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, I venture to say, these gentlemen would be found standing up for the rights of the provinces. Why, then, should they not stand up for the rights of the provinces to-day. British Columbia has spoken with all the force she can command, through her public men, through her legislative assembly, through her boards of trade, through her town councils—the people have spoken with one voice against the granting of this charter, and yet hon. gentlemen are found forcing this measure upon this distant province to her disadvantage and to our shame. I am opposed to this Bill. As is well known, I am in favour of competition. And I do not think that gentlemen in this House will say that I have ever hesitated to oppose the Canadian Pacific Railway where I thought I should do so in the interests of the people. In fact, I have generally been found opposing. Hon. gentlemen may be sure, therefore, that I do not oppose the granting of this charter because I desire to see the Canadian Pacific Railway getting more power than they have or more lines of railway, but because I think the extension of their railway to that country is going to be for the best interests of the people of that country and is going to retain for the Canadian people what belongs to the Canadians and ought to be kept at home. For these reasons I am opposed to this charter and in favour of supporting a company that is putting in a railway that will not cost the people a cent. It is sometimes said that Mr. Corbin does not ask a bonus. I know he does not, because the outlook upon the future justifies the belief that he will have ample return in the freight rates he can charge. But neither does the Canadian Pacific Railway ask any bonus, and the effect of their building a line will be to keep Canada for the Canadians so far as this matter is concerned. They keep that country for the eastern manufacturer and the western farmer, and keep money at home which is now being