

and also whether those telegrams signed by different parties, as mayors of the respective localities, are authentic or not. On these several grounds, I think we should not dispose of the Bill now, in order to inquire into the exact nature of the facts mentioned.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is discussing the general question, whether this Bill should be adopted or not, on a particular clause concerning the capital of this company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I exceedingly regret to say that the point of order is not well taken. The motion before the House is for the committee to rise and report progress, and on such a motion the hon. gentleman has a right to discuss the general question.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) It is quite plain that there exists on the part of some hon. gentlemen a disposition to make obstruction, so as to prevent us from voting upon the motion which is now before the committee, and from discussing the Bill now under consideration. I exonerate the hon. gentlemen from all blame, for trying to call me to order; but, at the same time, let me tell him that I am happy to see, by the few remarks he has just made, that he understands French perfectly, so as to follow in an intelligent way the arguments I have submitted to the committee. According to your ruling, Sir, I have a right to discuss the motion now before us. It must be borne in mind that we are now discussing clause 6, but that we may also deal with the different provisions of this Bill. I do not intend to argue this question at any length, for I do not wish, in protracting the debate, to prevent the committee from voting on this motion before the time allotted to the consideration of similar Bills has expired. However, Sir, I think it right, before resuming my seat, to call the attention of the committee to the principle laid down here to-night. I draw attention to the fact that it would be establishing a very dangerous precedent, for this committee to accept a provision altogether different from that voted upon by the Railway Committee. As I said, supposing there was no other ground to induce us to vote in favour of the motion under consideration, I would not hesitate a single moment to take that course.

Mr. McINNES. This is an important matter, since it involves the question whether we are going to reserve for the citizens of our country the enjoyment of the benefits which will necessarily arise from the full development of our great natural resources. All those who spoke in the Railway Committee or who have given this matter any consideration at all agree that the Boundary Creek section of British Columbia is exceedingly rich in mineral wealth; and while it may be difficult to choose between the different sections of that pro-

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

vince, without making invidious distinctions, yet it can be said that there is greater valuable mineral wealth in the Kootenay country than in any other part of British Columbia, the development of which will certainly give rise to a larger amount of trade than any other region of the same extent in that province. I have before me the "Hansard" of 1897 in which I find the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways upon the Crow's Nest Pass proposition. In that speech he dwelt at length upon the wealth not only of the eastern section of British Columbia, but also of this very Boundary Creek section, which we are now considering in connection with this Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Whose speech is that?

Mr. McINNES. The Minister of Railways, and I intend to read some sections of it, in which he said that he was in a position to speak on these matters with great confidence and considerable authority. I therefore quote with a great deal of confidence the remarks which he made, especially with reference to the mineral wealth of this section:

I have in my hand another authoritative statement which I think it proper to put in possession of the committee. A representative of the Imperial German Government took occasion to visit British Columbia, and spent some months in the portions that I have mentioned, including the Boundary district, of which he made a careful study. He himself was a mineralogical expert, and had studied the situation in Australia, in South Africa, and in other mining countries of the world; and, I suppose it was on account of his ability in that regard that the Imperial German Government charged him with the duty of making to them a careful report of the possibilities and of the outlook of the province of British Columbia, and of the neighbouring state of Washington. He went over both these sections of country. I will only take up the time of the committee by reading an extract from this interesting report. To me it was an exceedingly interesting report, because it was not only a careful and conservative report, the report of a man who apparently was determined not to exaggerate the condition of things at all, but it was a report at the same time of one who had no interest in overstating the case in any way, but who only wished to present the facts for the information of his Government.

Mr. WILSON. What is the name of the gentleman?

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. His name is Hans Geise. He went over all the different districts of British Columbia that I have named. He went first through Rossland, then into the West Kootenay section, the East Kootenay section and Boundary Creek, up to Lillooet, and his survey of the situation embraces all these various portions of British Columbia. In referring to Boundary Creek, he says:

"The third division is the Boundary Creek itself, with its various camps. Here it is not so easy to decide the question of the superiority of any one spot over the other. Midway is here the central point of a wider country, but it is outside the cluster of Boundary Creek camps. There have,