

Columbia in 1897, when they granted a charter to this railway company, was to have a road constructed in Canadian territory. I did not even oppose a road diverging into the United States if that was absolutely necessary. I moved an amendment in the Railway Committee to the effect that the road from Burrard Inlet or Vancouver to Princeton should be constructed before permission was given to cross the boundary line; but that did not prevent the company crossing the boundary line. My intention was to make sure that the road from Cloverdale to Princeton should be constructed at all hazards. I desire to make my position perfectly clear. I never opposed the construction of this road; but I endeavoured to procure for the people of British Columbia an all-Canadian road from Similkameen valley through New Westminster to Vancouver, before there should be any divergence into the State of Washington. Now that the government have announced their policy, I do not think that the hon. member for North Toronto, even if he were here, would move his amendment. I do not see any advantage in it. All the information I could get from British Columbia, from the newspapers, from the resolutions of boards of trade, and in other ways, was that the people wanted the road from the coast to the Kootenay built on Canadian territory, and I did all I could to secure that. If there is any responsibility for the divergence of the road before it is completed from Cloverdale to Princeton, the government assume it and leave the promoters of the road free to construct the Canadian portion or not, before they diverge to the United States.

Mr. GALLIHER. I believe that the members whom the people of British Columbia have sent here can be trusted to look after the interests of British Columbia without calling to their aid the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). I was rather amused to hear the hon. member state that he has always been in favour of this Bill. If you turn up the records, I think you will find that the hon. member for Halton among others voted against the preamble. With regard to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Halton, that the company should not be allowed to cross the boundary line until they built from the coast to Princeton, what would that have meant? It would have meant at least the loss of two years before the road from Princeton to Medway in the boundary country could have been built, and that valley would have been without railway service. I feel satisfied, and so do my colleagues from British Columbia, that the road from Princeton to Vancouver will be running over all-Canadian territory before another railway builds from Princeton to the boundary country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am quite prepared to defend myself in this House without the

aid of the hon. member. He tells us that the people of British Columbia have sent certain representatives here who he says are able to look after the interests of British Columbia. Well, I am not very sure that they are.

Mr. GALLIHER. If we are not, we will send for some one we have more confidence in than the hon. member for Halton.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member may keep his mind easy. A year ago the hon. member made an elaborate speech in this House pleading with the government for a duty on lead. He did that in response to a request from the people of British Columbia, and when the vote came on, he turned around and voted against it. He voted down the very resolution which would have given him what he wanted. Does he mean to tell us that he is here to defend the interests of British Columbia?

Mr. GALLIHER. Since then the people elected me by the second largest majority in British Columbia.

Mr. HENDERSON. The vote of the hon. member last year shows that he is here first in the interests of his political party. I believe in supporting the interests of my province and country first, even if I have to vote against my party, in a matter of such material consequence. After the hon. gentleman told us that he wanted a duty on lead, I was ashamed to see him cast a vote declaring that protection to that industry was not required. After that the hon. gentleman need not tell us that the people of British Columbia can trust their representatives. But that is aside from the question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. But I think it is sufficient to show that the hon. gentleman is not what he represents himself to be, namely, a pure representative of the interests of British Columbia. I repeat there is no object on this side in moving the resolution proposed by the hon. member for North Toronto. The government having taken their position on that question, I have no desire to do it nor have we on this side. I leave it to the government to carry out the policy they have proposed. I thought it would be a good thing to get some assurance from the railway company, which is seeking a charter, that they would construct that road on Canadian territory. All that I asked was a guarantee that that should be done, but did not want to refuse them a charter to cross the boundary line if they desired. I think our amendment was extremely moderate and fair. All we wanted to do was to protect Canadian interests; and these interests being protected, we tell the company practically by a resolution that if they desire to cross the boundary line by diverting the railway, they may do so if absolutely necessary. I have no desire to