

lar, which increase of value will be due to the labour and industry of the people of this country. So that, taking the conditions altogether, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, making of course the best bargain that they could, have succeeded in making a very good bargain indeed from their standpoint with respect to the conditions upon which this railway should be built. Under these circumstances the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had gone to both the government of British Columbia and to this government for concessions in respect of the terminus upon the Pacific. A certain arrangement had been made with the government of British Columbia for a concession of 10,000 acres of land at \$1 per acre with certain reservations to which I alluded when reading this order in council on Friday last.

Mr. MACPHERSON. With whom did the provincial government deal for the 10,000 acres granted to the company?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It made the grant to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company through the agent of that company.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The agent?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, Mr. E. V. Bodwell, a very prominent Liberal of the city of Victoria.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Is there nothing about Mr. Anderson as well?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have the official documents before me; they do not contain any reference to Mr. Anderson. Is the hon. gentleman aware that they do, or that the grant is a grant to Mr. Anderson?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Through Mr. Anderson.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it to him?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Through him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have the official documents, and the grant contains no reference to him. The correspondence contains a reference to E. V. Bodwell, and describes him as the agent of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

When my hon. friend interrupted me with his somewhat irrelevant question, I was alluding to the terms upon which the government of the province of British Columbia have made this grant to the company. Perhaps, in order to avoid any doubt upon the subject, I might refer to them again. The conditions were: 1. A reservation of such portion of the land granted, not exceeding one-twentieth thereof, as might be deemed necessary for making roads, culverts, bridges, towing paths or other works of public utility; 2. Reservation of the right of all minerals on the land; 3. Reservation of water privileges upon the land and the right of carrying water for the purpose of mining or agricultural purposes; 4. Reservation of the right to take, without

Mr. R. L. BORDEN

compensation, gravel, sand, stone, lime, timber and other similar materials required for bridges and public works; 5. Reservation of one-fourth of all town lots which may be laid out; 6. Reservation of one-fourth of all frontage upon sea or waterway, with the provision that such frontage shall be divided into lots not less than 1,000 feet; 7. Reservation to the Crown or the right of reconveyance of one-fourth of all such land embraced in the grant as should not be divided into town lots or waterfront lots.

Those were the principal reservations, although not all of them. Now, the terms of the grant are perhaps not very material. The point which I desire to bring to the attention of the House to-day is this, that I do not find in the terms of the constitution any justification for the interference by this government with the action of the executive of the province of British Columbia in respect of a matter of that kind. Under the terms of our constitution, the scope of the legislative jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada and the scope of the legislative jurisdiction of the province of British Columbia are sharply defined, and with equal sharpness are defined the scope of the executive action by the Governor in Council of Canada and the scope of the executive action by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province of British Columbia. It was not intended that there should be any interference by the parliament or government of Canada with the advice which might be tendered, from time to time, by the executive council of the province of British Columbia to the Governor of that province. The very terms of our constitution, the very basis of it, which is a federal one, forbid the governor of the province of British Columbia to accept advice, except from his constitutional advisers, and the constitutional advisers of the Lieutenant Governor of the province of British Columbia are the members of his executive council, the members of his cabinet, and not the members of the cabinet of Canada; and, for my part, I see no good reason why the government of Canada should have seen fit to tender any advice or recommendation to the Lieutenant Governor on this subject. It was a breach of constitutional decorum, and the advice so tendered and the action of this government in tendering it seem to me to have been altogether unwarrantable, impertinent and meddlesome.

I think it is only right, under these circumstances, to bring the matter to the attention of the House, because there is a marked change in the attitude of hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches from that which they assumed in days gone by. In the years between 1878 and 1896, and especially between 1886 and 1896, during the years in which the right hon. gentleman