

It is hereby provided that the Governor in Council shall grant no permission to construct any part of the proposed road south of the international boundary unless it be shown to be necessary in order to overcome engineering difficulties, nor until satisfactory guarantees are given that the line from Cloverdale to Princeton will be completed on Canadian territory within a reasonable time.

It may be suggested that a part of this amendment is covered by the amendment of Mr. Macpherson, which is as follows:

The company shall within two years from the passing of this Act, commence the construction of the western portion of its main line from a point at or near Cloverdale, and continuously prosecute construction in an easterly direction to Princeton, along the route as laid down in the original charter of the company, being chapter 75 of 60 Victoria of the statutes of British Columbia.

That, however, I do not think has any great virtue in it. There is no penalty, so far as I can see, which will be incurred provided that it is not carried out by the company, except that if the company does not carry out its work as laid down in the Act, its charter powers at a certain time will lapse unless they are again renewed. What I wanted to do was to make sure that if that road could be built on Canadian territory, it should be built on Canadian territory. I also wanted to make sure that if it had to be diverted—and there could be no reason for the diversion other than engineering difficulties—to the south of the line, that diversion should be limited and temporary, and should not include the possibility of running south of the line for a longer or a shorter distance, as the company itself might think would be best in its own interests, but that the road should come into Canadian territory again after that engineering difficulty had been overcome, and that it should be carried through to the coast, opening up and developing Canadian territory and connecting it with the cities on the coast. Now, it has been rather assiduously circulated that my opposition and the opposition of others with me in this respect was due not so much to good and patriotic reasons as to a desire to burk the construction of this road and to preserve the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am quite willing that any person shall form whatever idea he chooses as to my motives. That conclusion will vary, I suppose, according to the amount of charity and the like of that in the person who forms it, but I rest my case entirely upon the reasons which I give and on the policy which I think is the correct policy. I do not think any good Canadian will contravene the statement that, other things being equal, it is to the advantage of Canada that those roads which are meant for the development of Canadian raw resources and the opening up of Canadian territory should be constructed on Canadian soil. A trunk line running through that country and termin-

Mr. FOSTER.

ating on the Pacific coast, making a connection between those, as I hope very rich undeveloped resources in the Similkameen valley and the country adjoining, and the sea coast, and the large cities and the trading centres on the sea coast, would keep up that connection and make it quick and constant. There is no doubt that a road of that kind would promote the development of that country and inure to the best interests of Canada as a whole, better than would a system of branch or tapping lines from the United States, drawing off the undeveloped resources of our country for the purpose of working them up and developing them with the enterprise and capital and labour of another country.

It would be much better to have a trunk line along there in that way than branch lines running up from the roads in the United States, tapping our country at certain points and drawing off our resources in the way I have stated. If we do agree that that is the better plan, what is the reason why it should not be adopted? The only reason is that there are engineering difficulties and that a part of the Canadian country north of the International boundary line between certain limits, not very long as it is theoretically stated, in extent, extending some thirty of thirty-five miles, which will make it, if not next to impossible, very expensive to build the road, and which will make it a road less easily operated commercially, because of the height it has to ascend and descend again. I do not think it is anything too much to say that in the committee we were not treated to any information regarding these engineering difficulties which would be considered as adequate and satisfactory. The statement was made that there were engineering difficulties, that there would be heights running up to thousands of feet, and that the grades would have to be, if not very largely distanced out, pretty steep. But as regards engineering reports or engineering evidence, there was nothing satisfactory submitted to the committee. There were statements of lay men which may have been well enough so far as they went, but there was no testimony of engineers given. What objection then can be taken to the course that we suggest? If it be not considered well to make it a provision in the Act, at least make somebody responsible that these engineering difficulties shall be shown to exist before the line shall be allowed to diverge to the south of the international boundary. For customs and other reasons, it would be better to run north of the international boundary line. But if it is shown impossible to get a commercial line north of that, I would not take it upon myself personally to object to the divergence, provided that that diversion were limited in extent, and that as soon as the engineering difficulties were overcome, the line should go back to Canadian territory