

this House know it if it has any bearing on the question. I do not know what position the War Eagle takes on this question, whether it favours these divergences or not; I have made no inquiry. I have simply been endeavouring to ascertain public opinion in British Columbia. I read these articles without making any inquiry as to who was the holder of the stock or as to what the political predilection of these newspapers is. I do not know whether this is a Liberal or Conservative paper. I do not know, as I have made no inquiry, in regard to the other paper from which I have already quoted. I know nothing about it whether the War Eagle holds the stock of this paper or whether it is held by the hon. member from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross). It may be that he is a stockholder in this paper as well; I do not say so; I know nothing about it, but I take this as an independent expression of public opinion in British Columbia and I will read you this article. It is headed

Firmness only Necessary.

This is from the edition of June 28.

Mr. TALBOT. Does not the hon. gentleman think it will be just as well to read a few of the salient points of that article without reading the whole of it?

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly it would be, but I believe the hon. gentleman will be the better for hearing the whole article read. I think it would perhaps enable him to arrive at a better judgment on the whole question. The hon. gentleman has not been present in all these discussions, and I am reading these articles for his benefit and that of others. This is the article headed 'Firmness only Necessary.' I presume the hon. gentleman thinks that I am speaking against time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am doing nothing of the kind. I expect this Bill will go through, and I am not going to prevent it. I am not going to prevent its third reading, but before it goes to a third reading I am going to place on record a justification for the action I have taken in this House, and of others who have taken the same stand.

Mr. GALLIHER. The hon. member opposed the preamble tooth and nail, he opposed the very first clause of the Bill tooth and nail, and voted against it from start to finish. Such opposition was not necessary to cure any defect that might have been in it when it first came before parliament.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) that I have already opposed the preamble of the Bill and the first clause of the Bill, and I was absolutely justified in doing so. The reasons I gave were strong and pertinent. I said it was impossible even for the local men on that committee to determine what that clause

meant, and the judgment of the committee was that the Bill should be referred to a special committee in order to interpret that clause. The committee fully endorsed the action I took, and it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentleman to say that I was taking a course contrary to the best interests of the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway.

Mr. GALLIHER. So you are.

Mr. HENDERSON. Very well, the hon. member may have his opinion. The people of British Columbia do not value his opinion very highly, according to the information I have here. Perhaps when he goes back to British Columbia he may find a good many more that will tell him the same thing. But that is not to the point.

Firmness only Necessary.

The Great Northern Railway penetrates British Columbia by no less than seven different branch lines between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific coast. These branch lines are built as feeders to the main Hill system. They give the people of southern British Columbia competitive transportation conditions to a limited extent, but whatever advantage is gained thereby is more than offset by the diversion of Canadian trade and wealth across the border. Nobody in this section wants to see a railway monopoly in the Kootenays and Yale, and there is no good reason why there should be a monopoly. The just requirements of the country demand the closest kind of railway competition compatible with sound national principles. If, however, the Dominion government is foolish enough to continue to pander to the greed and rapacity of Jim Hill, by permitting him to drain this country of more than half its rightful industrial prosperity simply to build up foreign cities and a foreign transportation company, it will be guilty of silly timidity and crass stupidity. Hill will never build an all-Canadian line from the interior of British Columbia to the Pacific sea-board if he is permitted to skim off the cream of our trade in the most favoured localities while allowing wide intervening stretches that are not so rich, both east and west, to shift as best they may for the lack of adequate transportation facilities. If the Ottawa government is loyal to the best interests of southern British Columbia it will insist upon Mr. Hill building an all-Canadian line to the coast, and refuse to permit him to dodge in and out as he has in the past. It is the duty of parliament to consider the needs of the many settlers on and around Anarchist Mountain, in the upland country north and west of Keremeos, and the rich but rugged sections in the Hope Mountains, as it is to provide railway advantages for the easily approached valley districts. Hill will never build through the more remote localities unless he is forced to, but when he is once made to understand that he must take the bad with the good in an all-Canadian route, he will soon drop into line and be thankful for any terms that would allow him an additional share of the great transportation business of southern British Columbia.

I would like to know where we could get a stronger endorsement of the course we have pursued with reference to this Bill