

ber for Vancouver the other day, when speaking of this matter in the Railway Committee, that he is also prepared to oppose the charter to the Columbia and Western, which will come before the Railway Committee later on.

Now, the people in the Boundary Creek country certainly think they are entitled to have the railway facilities which will enable them to go ahead and develop their mines in a way in which they cannot do at present. There are some twenty-two mines that have already shipped ore out of the country for the purpose of testing what its product would be when subjected to a straight smelter test. They have done this at considerable cost to themselves, but it was a cost which they considered justifiable in order to see whether they had valuable properties or not; and they are now very anxious to see this railway charter granted, because they realize that it would be the same for them as it has been for Nelson and Rossland—that the fact of having railways giving them competitive rates would materially assist them in developing the mines in a way which they will not be able to do if they are simply in the hands of one railway.

The hon. member for Vancouver made a great point of the resolution which was passed by the provincial legislature; but in mentioning the vote that was taken upon that resolution, he did not go into the question of the representation of the different parts of the country, which is a very material point in considering a matter of that kind. When that vote was taken in the provincial House, there were only two members of the Opposition who voted with the Government; it was very nearly a straight party vote. If the representation in the House had been according to population, the vote would have shown a very different result. As it is arranged at the present time, there are 2,328 voters in a district that would be in no way affected by the building of a railway in the Boundary Creek country; and these 2,328 voters have ten members in the provincial legislature, who naturally voted in favour of the resolution; while 2,497 voters in the districts that would be affected by the railway when built have only three members in that legislature, and all of these opposed the resolution. I do not think it is necessary for me to go through the whole list on this question of representation. I think the figures which I have quoted are sufficient to show hon. gentlemen that although there was a majority in the legislature voting in favour of that resolution, if there had been a proper representation according to population, the vote would in all probability have gone in a very different way. The hon. member for Vancouver referred to the fact that Colonel Baker voted in favour of the resolution, as if Colonel Baker was very keenly interested in that part of the country which would be

benefited by this railway. Colonel Baker represents a constituency in what is known as East Kootenay, which is some hundred miles to the east of the Boundary Creek country, through which this railway will run, and he is not altogether in touch with the wishes and desires of the people in the Boundary Creek country. I cannot state it as a fact, but I believe Colonel Baker has never made a trip through that country at all. But the members of the provincial legislature most in touch with that part of the country—the men who represent it, Mr. Graham, and the member of the adjoining constituency, Mr. Hume—both voted in favour of this resolution, and they are the best qualified in that House to realize what it means to that mining country to have the facilities for developing it that would be given to it by the granting of this charter.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to go again into the question of smelting, although it has been raised in this debate. It was very fully explained by the promoters of this Bill when it was before the Railway Committee, that the reason why the smelter was placed at Northport, instead of at some place on the Canadian side of the boundary line, was, first, owing to the necessity of having lime to mix with the Rossland ores for the purpose of forming a flux, and secondly, owing to the necessity of obtaining water for smelting. The hon. member for Vancouver to-day suggested that that smelter could have been as well placed at some point on the Canadian side of the boundary line, and I think he mentioned a place called Sayward. Now the hon. gentleman may not possibly know that when the gentlemen who are most largely interested in the smelter were looking over sites for it, they took into consideration the site at Sayward, and they were to some extent favourably impressed with it, and thought it would be a good position for a smelter. But when they came to look further into the matter and to try to find out how they were going to obtain the necessary water for the purpose of carrying on the smelter industry, they found Mr. Heintze had got control of the only available water in that part of the country for their business, and, therefore, they were absolutely precluded from establishing a smelter there, although they desired to do so. The further fact that they had a much better means of obtaining lime at Northport decided them to place the smelter down at that point. I do not think that any gentleman who looks at this matter from a business point of view will consider that they were wrong in taking the position they did. They were practically driven to put in their smelter at the point where they did put it, and any body of men who are going into that country for the purpose of putting up smelters must be guided by the same business principles. I do not consider myself, that the smelter question is very