

horses too high. I will tell hon. gentlemen that a revision of the tariff was considered last year by a committee appointed by the late governor, and a majority of that committee, who were all businessmen, reported in favor of lowering the duties on agricultural produce, and there was a special report in favor of making Victoria almost a free port.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—That was the bogus Council, I suppose.

Hon. MR. HAMLEY—They were a committee of gentlemen whom the late Governor thought fit to appoint. I think the tariff must be altered to suit this colony, but I believe it must be left to the Canadian Parliament to alter. What will our representative members do sitting in the Canadian Parliament, except they look after our interests? There is no obstacle that I know of to there being a different tariff to suit the interests of this or any particular Province of the Dominion.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—There is no reason that there should be a similar tariff all over, but I think it must be altered by the Canadian Parliament.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I do not think that it is necessary that one tariff should prevail all over the Dominion.

Hon. MR. HAMLEY—Not at all, not at all.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—But there can be no differential duties; that is forbidden by English statutes.

Hon. MR. HAMLEY—No; not by statute; by instructions.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—So far from leaving it to the Canadian Parliament, I say we must go in with it altered. How absurd for eight members to attempt to revise the tariff of British Columbia in the Dominion Parliament.

Hon. MR. TRUTCH—I don't see it.

Hon. MR. HAMLEY—Nor do I.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—Why, look how ridiculous it is to come to this House to propose any alteration in the tariff. How much more so in the Dominion Parliament, where so many would be on the other side. If at all, it must be done by ourselves. The Canadian Government must agree to it before we go into Confederation. The other interests are subsidiary to it.

On motion of hon. Mr. Ring, the debate was adjourned to Wednesday the 23rd.

Wednesday, 23rd March, 1870.

Hon. MR. WOOD rose to resume the debate on Tariff and said: Mr. Chairman—In speaking to the motions now before the House, it will hardly be necessary for me to say that I think that this question of Tariff the most important of all that have been introduced during this debate; my object is, as I have said, to reduce to the utmost, in the event of Confederation with Canada, the chance of difference with the Dominion, my objection to Confederation being that, however much it may apparently and at first

tend to confer upon the colony material benefits—yet there is every fear of consequent reaction and disaffection. In dealing with the matter it will be necessary to see whether the subject of Tariff now before us will have the affect of raising a direct question and difference between this colony and Canada. Tariff is not simply a mode of collecting taxes, it is a system with a double object. The object of obtaining revenue, and in the obtaining of that revenue, the further object of promoting domestic and home industries by a just discrimination between the subject matter on which taxation is levied. The question of Tariff directly tends to promote or depress domestic productions, and domestic trade; consequently the chances of difference and reaction depend on whether our interests are identical with those of Canada, or whether there is a conflict. The intended future Dominion of Canada is obviously divided so far as this question is concerned into two parts, that which is to the east and that which is to the west of the Rocky Mountains, the Atlantic and Pacific portions of that Dominion, and to these several divisions there appertain distinct and several industrial interests; agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial. Let us run through in our own minds, our own, the Pacific interests, so to say, the interests in fact of this present colony. First we have the agricultural interests; this is a material interest, as I trust it always will be considered in every colony—it is an industry which a government cannot well avoid materially to assist. I don't say "protect" but "assist," and this whether agricultural produce be a staple of the colony or not. I may here remark that I use the word "staple" in what I understand to be received acceptation of the word—produce, exportable produce, raised in a colony with advantage and at a remunerative rate to the producer, and capable of being exchanged with advantage for the produce of other countries in the markets of the world. Our next material interests are our own staples, properly so-called as above defined, such for instance as the wool of Australia, gold anywhere, or fisheries, as in Newfoundland. Our particular staples are our fisheries, our forests and our minerals to say nothing of certain aptitudes for ship-building and the repairing of ships. Next, we must take trade and commerce, our local and geographical position being such as to give us some advantage in the distribution of goods, and as such is to be regarded as an element of wealth, and one of our material interests. Let us now turn to Canada; Canada has manufacturers, but not by way of staples, because she cannot under sell the old world in manufactured goods, but with a population of, I suppose, over three millions she can produce sufficient manufactures of certain descriptions for her own use. Then her staples are agriculture, produce, lumber and a certain amount of minerals, and perhaps horns and tallow. Agricultural produce

is a staple in Canada; she exports it, therefore it requires no protection; it would be no good to impose a tariff upon it. In manufactures there is such a tariff as will slightly protect manufactures, as with us we give the same turn of the market to the farmer by a slight tariff on agricultural produce. Following the common law of self-interest, British Columbia is bound to protect her own interests and Canada the same. Let us see whether or not there is a manifest tendency to protection in the Dominion Legislature. It has been stated in this debate that Canada is adverse to protection, that she wants to follow England and the old world in the direction of free trade. I say that those who make the assertion must prove it. (Hear, hear, from Mr. DeCosmos.) I say that my sources of information tend to show that it is untrue that Canada favors free trade. She desires to protect her own manufactures. Right or wrong as a political theory, new countries will be found as soon as manufactures are possible, desirous to protect their own native industries, whereas it suits old countries to have free trade. In England manufactured goods are in reality her staples. England can compete with the world in most classes of manufacturing goods, from her manifest advantages in having coal and iron in close proximity, moderately cheap labor, and established industries; to say nothing of the commercial energy of her people. Some of the writers say that America and many of the colonies of Great Britain suffer from protection. I say that suffer or not suffer, they insist upon it. I say nothing now of my convictions. I think however, that the theory of free trade goes too far. "Free Trade" is quoted as if it were a golden rule. I believe that free trade is an exceedingly elastic idea; there is no orthodoxy in it, it is not a law of physics like the law of gravitation or some obtruse and elaborate theory like Stur'n's problem or the stability of the eccentricity of the planetary orbits, to which there is no exception. It is elastic and suits one country and not another; it suits old countries and not new; it suits England for the reasons I have stated. Her manufactures are her staples. She can undersell the world. People may say that free trade is applicable equally to other places and to all classes of industries; as to this I have my own opinions. But so far as this discussion is concerned, I deal with the world as I find it. New countries desire protection. Why? No matter why—they do desire it. Dealing with protection in a moderate way I think it may be reasonably conceded that a moderate protection, in the way of customs duties at least, may be applied to staple productions and agriculture. But whether the opinion be sound or not colonial experience shows us that this is the line of argument pursued and acted on. Taking it for granted as admitted by some political writers of eminence that we may reasonably protect staples until they can support them-

selves, let us see what legitimate protection may be afforded to existing interests in this colony. Agriculture may be protected or rather fostered in numbers of ways. By facilities for the acquisition of land, by roads, by immigration of farm hands, by the admission of implements free, and by a moderate tariff on produce. Agriculture, it must be remembered, is not only the cultivation of the land; it is bound up with local interests and carries with it a local population attached to the soil. If you want population localised you must encourage agricultural interests. Besides this, it must not be lost sight of, that it is a practical remedy against poverty. If a man has certain faculties for acquiring, or being employed as a labourer on land, he never need go to the poor house—it humanises men. It is the duty of every politician to protect agricultural interests in a new country to the best of his power. Now with regard to staples, I say they may reasonably be protected and fostered in their infancy, because they are the real wealth of the nation. It is said that at first the wool interest of Australia was carried on at a loss, and for a country like this that can produce without limit fish, lumber and coals, to say nothing of gold, we must give all the facilities in our power to induce industry in these walks of life. Take the gold miner; we might give him his gold license cheap, and make the acquisition of claims easy, provide him with roads and trails and in this way we might "protect" the miner, and encourage mining interests. Fisheries, how are they to be protected? By the promotion of information as to markets for fish—by pushing those markets—by local knowledge of the haunts of fish, by cheap implements, and by cheap salt. To promote the lumber interest we might give cheap machinery so far as we can by admitting it free, and let persons acquire land easily. Shipwrights might also be legitimately protected and encouraged by making implements and materials cheap and by giving encouragement to Docks. Let us do everything to promote the interests of ships, where there are such natural inlets as ours, with coal at hand, and facilities for the importation of iron and steel for building ships, we could build cheaper than anywhere on this coast; not of course so cheaply as on the Clyde but still we might attract some shipbuilders. Now as to trade. Export trade. This is surely an item, though possibly a small item in our wealth; yet still if we export only to Puget Sound we might encourage such commerce. It is an industry and a source of wealth; it causes foreign ships to come and causes an expenditure of money in our ports; it adds to the number of merchants, drays and laborers, and increases general business; a vitality is given by it which makes it an element of wealth, it seems to have been beneficial here, and certain it is that it is estimated in this colony as a material interest. How is this export trade to be protected? Some say by

Free Port, that is to say, no customs duties; others say "reduce taxation to a minimum on goods in which there is a tangible export trade." Within these limits of what we may call moderate protection we may reasonably suppose the colonists of British Columbia to be desirous to legislate, and suppose we desire to have implements of labour and machinery and some goods cheap and free, and put ten per cent on imported agricultural produce. This is the reverse of Canadian policy—as regards machinery, I believe the Canadian tariff gives fifteen per cent on manufactured machinery at least. There is nothing to prevent the Canadian tariff from being increased. Protection may run rampant in the Dominion. You have no guarantee. I say that in these fiscal questions we are at issue as affects some of our most important elements of national wealth. There would be a conflict, not only between the tariffs of British Columbia and Canada but between the protective policy of each province. How is this cause of discontent and conflict of interest to be removed? Why, by a British Columbia tariff for British Columbia. This place has no commercial connection with Canada. Canada affords us no market. There is no frontier to cause a difficulty with custom house officers. Why not have different tariffs. In the event of reciprocity with the United States we might be compelled to sacrifice the farmer, but possibly he might be in a condition to support himself by produce for which we have some special aptitude. Assuredly we shall have discontent or worse if the tariff is made oppressive, if we have for it to suffer the extinction or the disadvantage of our own industries. I have said hastily, give us our own tariff and I am almost in favour of Confederation. I think I must take that expression of opinion back. There are so many other matters, so many points of difference between us and Canada, that under any circumstances there would be a continual struggle with the other provinces. But however this may be, if you wish not to provoke and keep up a sore question have a separate tariff. Give to Canada and Canadian interests a tariff framed to meet their wants, and give to British Columbia its own especial tariff. If the tariff of Canada is to rule I fear it will never be altered, for the feeble voice of our eight members would never be listened to in the Parliament of Ottawa, and the Canadian tariff, framed for the support and maintenance of Canadian interests, would assuredly prevail.

The Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER said—Sir, After the very able abstract review of the whole question of Tariff customs and taxation of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I will not add anything by way of dissertation. But I must recall the house to the practical consideration of the subject. I acknowledge the ability of the hon. and learned member, and quite agree with him that this is one of the most important matters connected with confederation. Then

why, it might be asked, was it not touched upon in the terms? Not because it has not been fully considered, but because the Organic Act puts it virtually out of the power of the Colony to prescribe what form of Tariff we should have under Confederation. The scheme as has been already pointed out by the Hon. Commissioner of Customs is based on the transfer of the control of our customs to Canada, therefore it is not within our province under the scheme submitted, to impose on the Dominion, or even to propose any special tariff for this Colony; but this is a matter which is left open for the consideration of this Colony on its merits, and is left open, as the hon. member for Victoria has told you, for this Council to make suggestions as to what tariff may be desirable under Confederation. I take this opportunity to set right the impression which seems to prevail as to the liberty of government members upon this question. It is not left open to us to complicate the terms by inserting any condition as to make it in fact a *SINE QUA NON*; but it is left open for this Council to suggest what tariff would be suitable for this Colony. The hon. Mr. Wood has discussed this matter on its abstract merits, as if it was in our power to dictate to Canada what tariff we should have; he has laid before this House very ably the pros and cons of tariff and free port. It is for us to consider what tariff would best suit us in or out of Confederation; but it is not allowed to us to prescribe to the Dominion what form of customs duties they shall adopt in this Colony, or in this province, as it will be. We have placed the control of the matter out of our hands, (No, no—Hons. Helmcken and Wood). Well, Sir, I believe we have: I say that view is imposed upon us by the terms, and I think it is better that it should be so; and for this reason: We, as being acquainted with the wants of the place, are best able to point out in what respect we need protection and where our interests are likely to suffer from the tariff of the Eastern Provinces. But I believe, Sir, that there are those in the Dominion whose larger experience and mature views will render them much better able than us to supply such remedy as will be most beneficial. I am perfectly willing to explain my views on the subject of tariff and free port in the abstract, and the government invite the freest discussion on the point both as regards protection to agriculture and manufactures, and free port. But I believe it will be better for the Colony to leave the decision and the remedy for the evils to those who will have the care of this province as well as the Eastern provinces. I think it will be to the interest of statesmen in the Dominion to treat this Colony well. Instead of feeling any want of confidence in those statesmen, I feel sure that every possible measure to promote the interests of this Colony will be well considered. They are in a better position to decide what will be most beneficial to this Colony even in regard to tariff. I would rather hear more opinions

expressed before I offer a suggestion; it is my intention to offer a resolution in general terms, so as to suggest to the Dominion Government that our agricultural interests must be protected and that certain things are required, and to ask the Dominion for such special provisions, in regard to tariff as we think we require. We are not in a position, after having endorsed the scheme of the Government, and after having handed over the sole control of the customs to Canada, to prescribe what tariff we shall have, or to impose conditions as to our local tariff.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—Mr. Chairman, while I consider the question of tariff one of very great importance, it does not appear to me that it necessarily forms any part of the terms. It is, in my opinion, futile to imagine that we shall obtain power, under Confederation, to frame and regulate our own tariff. The customs tariff is essentially a federal measure, and the Dominion Government cannot very well permit a province to make its own tariff. To do so would, in my opinion, be to admit a principle which would ultimately break up the whole Confederation. If such a concession were made to British Columbia every other province in the Dominion would forthwith clamor for it. The Dominion tariff is of necessity a federal matter, to be dealt with by the Federal Parliament, and it is unreasonable to expect that such an exception will be made in our favor. The customs tariff is the main source of federal revenue; and if any province were permitted to tinker with it the federal revenue would indeed be precarious. History does not encourage us to hope for such a power. Taking the United States which, in this respect, presents conditions not dissimilar to those of the Dominion, we find that the customs tariff has ever been a federal question. To no state or territory has it been conceded to deal with its own tariff. If the strongest reasons had not existed for this, we should certainly have found exceptions made in favor of Pacific States and territories. Hon. members will recollect the bitter complaints made in earlier times on this coast against federal tariffs; yet the people, while complaining, were never foolish enough to claim or expect the right to regulate their own tariff. They knew perfectly well that such a power was wholly incompatible with union. It is as well that we should not cling to any such hope as that of being permitted to make and regulate our own tariff under Confederation. I quite concur with the hon. the Chief Commissioner in the view that, notwithstanding the difference in existing conditions on this side of the continent and on the Atlantic side of it, there are many questions even of tariff which would be more successfully dealt with at Ottawa, and that our representatives would be listened to and would have their due weight upon such questions. Probably through their influence the tariff would, in some respects, be made more conformable to our circumstances and interests; but the Dominion tariff must be altered and main-

tained by the Federal Parliament and not by any provincial authority. We occupy a very exceptional position and shall do so for years, in regard to such questions; and this might justify us in asserting that the tariff of Canada, as a whole, is not applicable to British Columbia at present. But, Sir, permit me to say that this question, like most others, has two sides to it, and has not been approached with that fairness and candor which its great importance demands. We are very apt to estimate protection above its real value—to forget the price we pay for it. Even our farmers sometimes pay more for protection than it is in reality worth to them. Under free trade the products of this part of the Colony commanded a much more ready market and higher prices than they do now after three years of protection. I am willing to admit that a few farmers have thriven, partly, perhaps, on protection, but partly, too, I am apt to think, at the expense of other classes and other interests in the Colony. Let us remember that protection is not an unmixed good and that it sometimes costs more than it is really worth. It should also be remembered that the importance of protection is somewhat localized in its application. Nature has given ample protection to the interior of the Colony; and it is, in reality, only on this island and the Lower Fraser that artificial protection can be demanded. I venture to think that there is a great future before Vancouver Island; but I do not believe that it will ever owe its greatness to agricultural development. I believe that its commercial, maritime, mineral and manufacturing industries will far outweigh its farming interests, and I do not think, therefore, that we would be justified in refusing Confederation upon fair and equitable terms, simply because we could not have power to regulate the customs tariff. I regret that I am unable to agree with any one of the recommendations now before the committee. The wisest course, in my opinion, will be to ask the Dominion Government to withhold the application of the federal tariff of customs to British Columbia for a fixed period, say, until railway communication shall have been established through the Dominion to the Pacific. Until that takes place British Columbia must continue to occupy a position so isolated and so exceptional as to render the general tariff, however well adapted to the Provinces to the Eastward of the Rocky Mountains, scarcely suited to us. But with the opening of continuous railway communication these exceptional conditions will for the most part disappear. Look, for instance, at California. What a complete revolution the railway has wrought in the condition of that State. The moment the railway was opened California was no longer separated from the great commercial centres of the Eastern States by thousands of miles of sedge-bush and desert. It was practically set down alongside of them; or, to use the words of another, time and space were annihilated, and California became, for the first time, a fitting subject

of a common tariff framed at Washington, and enforced throughout the widespread Union. Similar results will be realized in our own case. Upon the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway British Columbia will practically be set down alongside of the Atlantic Provinces. We get over all constitutional difficulties by approaching the subject in this way. I do not say that the Dominion Government will assent to the proposition to postpone the application of their tariff to this colony until railway communication shall have been established; but we will approach them with a much greater show of reason and success in this way than in the other. I shall, therefore, propose an amendment or a recommendation, asking that the customs tariff of the Dominion be not extended over the colony of British Columbia until railway communication therewith shall have been established. Should this be agreed to on the part of the Canadian Government, it would then become our duty, upon entering the Dominion, to remodel our tariff with a view to protecting local industries, on the one hand, and building up our commercial and maritime interests, on the other. Canada might, possibly, sacrifice a little revenue in the first instance, but it would come back to her a hundred fold in the greatly enlarged prosperity certain to follow. In this way, also would be presented a living recognition of the necessity for railway communication, if not an incentive for the speedy consummation of that great desideratum. This course which I propose will more fully meet the local necessities of the country, while it will be more acceptable to the people, and, I feel assured, more likely to meet with the concurrence of the authorities at Ottawa. It possesses the advantages of accomplishing more good than can possibly be attained in the way proposed either by the hon. member for Victoria District or that proposed by another hon. member, and, at the same time of steering clear of constitutional difficulties.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—Sir, we have heard some very good and eloquent speeches. I intend to say a few words, and will begin with first principles: When the Confederation Delegates first met, they proposed to adopt a tariff similar to that of the United States—that the Federal Government alone should have the right to impose customs duties, that there should be no subsidies, and that each Province should raise its own revenue by direct taxation; but it was found that local governments were not favorable to direct taxation. At the Conference at Westminster it was at first proposed to give local legislatures power to make laws and impose direct taxation, but when the Organic Act was prepared that part was dropped out. I have desired to harmonize with the Organic Act; whatever we may do we should harmonize with the Organic Act; by so doing we shall meet with less objections at Ottawa. In looking at this question I may come to the conclusion that there is a possibility for the local government to raise taxes, but if it was referred to the Privy Council they

might say it clashed. I will illustrate my meaning. I think the legislature of Ontario voted an additional sum to one of the judges; the Privy Council said it was unconstitutional to do so. So it might be if the local government imposed a tax upon foreign produce and manufactures. But we must not clash with the Dominion Government. In case the Dominion enacted customs laws lower than our own we would have the privilege to put direct taxes on those articles so as to give protection to them. Turning to the Year Book, I find that in New Brunswick the export dues on lumber amount to \$70,000. This is an export revenue for a source of revenue. If the government of New Brunswick was able to except this item from the operation of the Dominion tariff why should we not be able to get the same sort of difference. The Canadian revenue will not suffer, every article will have to pay the Canadian tariff, and Canada will benefit by any prosperity that we enjoy.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—For how long do you propose to suspend the operation of the Dominion tariff?

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—I have said indefinitely—possibly for ten or twelve years—we may have the railway completed by that time. The hon. Mr. Wood put the question properly. The tariff is a thing that is changeable, it rises and falls. Suppose that Canada has to raise six millions for a guarantee for the railway, they might have to raise the tariff. I think the tariff will probably rise for a long time. But this is aside the issue. My object in making this proposition is to prevent clashing between our local government and the Dominion. I include produce in my recommendation, which means stock, cereals, and vegetables. If a provision of that sort were added we would be in a position to get a certain degree of protection, and the largest interest, that is the agricultural interest, will be satisfied. But I maintain that beyond this we ought to protect certain rude manufactures; and in going into the Dominion we should go in with as little friction as possible; there must be some friction, but we must keep things as smooth as possible. There will be, as I have said before, a revolution in labor and value. Now, we do not want too much protection. Let our agricultural interests be satisfied, and if those engaged in rude manufactures are protected the people will be satisfied. There are also a class engaged in trade who believe in protection; you will find then the agricultural interest, the manufacturing interest, and believers in protection, who will form a strong band of opponents to Confederation. Take away this subject of friction and you have the whole thing easier; if they are not considered there will be opposition before Confederation, and more after. If hon. members desire to keep up a feeling of loyalty towards Canada after Confederation, they will protect those interests. With respect to the hon. member for New Westminster, his argument is no stronger than his weakest point, which is, [Hon. Dr. Helm-

cken—His resolution]. Well, perhaps this is the weak point; he admits the whole point, I do not intend to follow the hon. member. I ask hon. members to consider this question so as to consider industries and manufactures so that the union may be lasting. I hope both sides will unite heartily in shaping our institutions with this end in view.

Hon. MR. RING—Mr. Chairman, I only desire to drop a few hints. I say that the Organic Act is wholly inapplicable to this colony. Does the hon. member for New Westminster mean to hand us over under this Organic Act to swell the coffers of the Dominion? I hail any approach to free trade; I believe in it; free trade should have as free a course as the wind. Now, sir, with regard to what has been said about protection to commerce; there are natural and artificial protections. I am for protecting the farmer by natural protections. Any attempt to shut out the surplus produce of another country must fail. The attempts to protect farmers by imposing a tax on flour and such articles is a mistake. Any protection beyond harbor and pilot dues is a vicious system. Then, say others, free port is abolished, would you go back to direct taxation. I say, how can we ascertain what the people can pay by taxing income and property. The revenue would be smaller, but it is now fictitious. We must curtail expenditure—and having done so I would abolish customs altogether as a source of revenue. I agree entirely with the proposition of the hon. member of New Westminster that the tariff of the Dominion is a federal matter.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the recommendation of the honorable member for Victoria District. I have listened carefully to the lofty arguments of the Government appointees on this question. It appears to me that the mistakes which the English generally make are attributable to their reading and studying Great English writers too much instead of considering what is practically applicable to a new country. Old countries are, in this respect, very different to new. Free trade may suit England and other old countries, whilst it may act very perniciously in a new one. Even in old countries a large portion of the people whom free trade is calculated to benefit are against it. But in new countries protection is absolutely necessary. It is said by some honorable gentlemen that the farming interests in the upper country needed no greater protection than nature had given them. I can mention an instance to the contrary. Flour was imported last year from California and sold in Cariboo at prices with which the upper country farmers could not compete. There ought to be some way of protecting the up country farmers without clashing with the interests of the Dominion. I think it but just and right to protect the farmers above all other interests. I look upon this question as next to responsible government and that I regard as the most important

question in the resolutions which are before the Council; all others sink into insignificance beside these two conditions.

The Hon. COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS—Notwithstanding that the local legislature after Confederation may not have a right to frame its own tariff, what we hope is that the Canadian Parliament will deem it desirable for their own interests that a special tariff should be framed for this part of the Dominion. There is no law against this. It would not be a differential duty; it cannot be objected to on this ground. Differential duties are where the same articles from two different countries are charged differently. If the Canadian tariff was applied here taxation would be lessened. We must not lose sight of that fact. It would probably be lessened to the extent of \$1,000,000 a year. I have estimated the difference upon one quarter's revenue, and I believe the difference to be at least \$20,000 for the quarter. For all that, I think the tariff should be changed. A special tariff is required. I mentioned yesterday horses and cattle. I think the \$15 on a horse and \$10 on cattle would be a great hardship on this colony; it would amount to a prohibition. Last year 1,700 head of cattle were imported into this city; are we prepared for the difference that the Canadian tariff would make in this item? I think this large duty would be most objectionable. With a tariff made especially to protect the farmers, over 40,000 pounds of butter were last year imported. If the Canadian tariff of four cents a pound were applied, I do not know that much more could come in. I think that the farmers must have sold all they had. I think that advocates of protection do not apply the principles of protection to farmers of the upper country, but those of Vancouver Island and the farmers will feel the weight of the protecting tariff without receiving any of its benefits. They will not feel the difference in the duty upon butter. I think that there will be a treaty of reciprocity between the United States and Canada, and I hope this colony will participate in it. It would be a great advantage. (Hear, hear!) I think the opening of the United States markets to our lumber would more than counterbalance the loss of protection on produce; I don't care for coal, they take as much as we can supply. I would suggest that this Council should send forward to Government a recommendation that we believe special tariff desirable, nay, almost imperative. I do not believe that our eight members in the House of Commons, and four in the Senate of Ottawa, will have no weight; if so, they had better come back. What in God's name good will they do? I think the question may be safely left to the Canadian Government and our representatives at Ottawa.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—With the view of bringing this to a vote I will propose this recommendation: That, in the opinion of this Council it is highly desirable that the agricultural, horticultural and dairy interests of British Columbia be protected; and I do

this in order to divide the question into two parts. One honorable member wants the power of suiting the tariff to our convenience, and more than one honorable member has said that confederation must come. I deny it. There is no necessity that it should come now. If the people vote against confederation when the terms come before them, His Excellency will inform her Majesty's Government that the people don't want it.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—We have always said so.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I have so stated fifty times already.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I am glad it is so understood. The honorable gentlemen must be very careful to make the terms suit, for if the terms don't suit the people we shall not have confederation. I say that the people have been seriously told that confederation was to be the destiny of this colony. (No! no! from Messrs. DeCosmos and Barnard.) Efforts have been made to impress on the colony that we must have confederation on any terms. I do not consider that it is necessary for us to go in under the Organic Act. We did not expect to do it. To the honorable Collector of Customs I would say, that much stress is laid upon the fact that under the Canadian tariff the people will save \$100,000; that is because the customs lose the people save. I say this does not follow. Canadian goods don't come here now because they cannot compete. The only reason they will be used is they will come in free, while others pay tariff. Possibly then the difference in price between Canadian goods and our goods may be very little; the Government may lose, but the people won't gain. Do you understand that? (No, no! from Hamley and others.) People may have to pay as much for Canadian goods as for American goods now.

Hon. COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS—American goods would come in less the duty now paid. Don't you see?

Hon. MR. WOOD—The difference of transport would prevent Canadian manufactures from coming here cheaper.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I say the tariff would be almost the same on those American goods then as now. I grant there will be a loss on agricultural produce; honorable gentlemen say they may send agricultural produce. Butter, I believe, comes from cows: it costs money to buy a cow; there is the difference between raising agricultural produce and cattle. If butter could be grown from the ground I don't suppose that forty tons would have been imported. Farmers are poor; they have not money to buy stock. Keep up protection and they will have money by-and-by to purchase cattle. Experience of the agriculturists in this colony has taught me that farmers with capital come out at the wrong end of the stick, whilst those who have gone in to work for themselves have made money. I know most of the farmers on Vancouver Island, and I find that those who began with nothing are doing well. The Hon. Collector of Customs said that farm-

ers in the upper country don't require a tariff. I went into that question yesterday. I think they will want it.

Hon. DR. CARRALL and MR. BARNARD—Prices are getting too high now.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—It is exceedingly easy and pleasant for us who want to eat to say prices are too high, but let any man go to work on a farm and he will have experience of the difficulties. The Hon. Collector of Customs says a treaty of reciprocity would be of great benefit, and that we might give up the farming interests of this colony for it. Now, sir, this Council said last year, almost unanimously, that agricultural interests must be protected. Why should honorable members think that we should require anything different under confederation? The honorable member for Victoria District almost led me the way in saying that irritation would arise which would lead to a desire for annexation if the agricultural interests were not protected.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—The interests we want to protect would be annihilated under confederation.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I say what we want now is what we want under confederation. Now, sir, what have we been trying for. What has been our policy? Why, to protect industry. I am told that the Dominion Government will not admit any alteration in our tariff and the example of the United States is cited. It has been said that California wanted to alter her tariff and was not allowed to do so. I say, in reply that California was one and a part of the United States. British Columbia is not yet confederated, so we are still in a position to make terms. California would have made terms if she could, but could not, and it was for a time a question whether she should not secede. It was only large subsidies and steam communication that kept California in the Union. There is this peculiarity in the Organic Act: section ninety-five enables Canada to make different laws as to agriculture in each different province.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I don't think that section applies to the tariff; it does not sound like it.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—Perhaps it does not, but I say that anything advantageous to the colony may be enacted by the local government. We can ask for a separate tariff and Canada has power to make different laws as to agriculture in each province.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—No, that is a mistake. The 95th section weakens the hon. member's argument.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I say it strengthens my argument. It does not mean merely that people may clean thistles out of their land. The simple issue is, shall agricultural interests be protected or not? It is quite possible that those who regulate the treaty, when brought into contact with Canadian statesmen, may devise some means whereby this result may be effected. I do not mean to give up to Canadian statesmen that they know more than ourselves about our local

affairs, but I do think we may utilize their experience. I do not think that people, when they know that Confederation will not be forced upon them, will accept Confederation. The question for the farmers will be, Shall agriculture be protected or not? I ask again, is agriculture protected by the resolution or not?

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—It is not a SINE QUA NON.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I think the idea to take a vote on protection to agriculture a good one, and I would rather that the resolution stopped there. Then I would propose a further resolution, pointing out the difficulties and ills we labor under.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I accept that alteration. We shall by it procure an expression of the opinion of the Council upon this point.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—I go further than that resolution. I stand here as a protectionist and I want to see the manufacturing interests protected as well as the agricultural interests. Protection will be a SINE QUA NON with my constituents. If the hon. senior member for Victoria will divide the question into agricultural interests, manufacturing interests and trade, I will withdraw my recommendation. I say that we want this question settled before Confederation. As for reciprocity, it has, in my opinion, to be based on existing industry. The most important treaty of reciprocity was between England and Portugal, under which English goods were admitted into Portugal and wines into England. Reciprocity to be successful must be based on existing industries. If we enter into a treaty of reciprocity with the United States, we must build up our industries, such as coal. I take it that what our coal has to contend with is foreign and native coal in the San Francisco and Portland markets. Unless there is an extended market for coal it is impossible to increase the trade in it. Reciprocity would destroy the most permanent interests; that, for instance, of agriculture, and we would gain nothing by it. I say if Canada thinks proper to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity with the United States we should be at liberty to negotiate a separate treaty, or to insert special clauses in the treaty.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Let us clear the ground by getting the Chairman to put this resolution as an abstract proposition.

The Chairman then read the resolution as an abstract proposition for the vote of the Council:

That in the opinion of this Council it is necessary that the agricultural, horticultural and dairy interests of British Columbia be protected.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to vote for that Proposition, but I do not go quite to the extent of believing it necessary, although I think it very desirable. I don't think it of such importance as the hon. members for Victoria City and District, as to make it a vital

question or a SINE QUA NON of Confederation. I think it is desirable to continue protection under Confederation, and I do not see why we cannot. I think that the Dominion Government may, perhaps, be better able to provide the ways and means to effect that object than ourselves. We may not be able to provide a remedy, but we may advise. The protection that we ask for only partially affects the community. It is patent that it only affects Vancouver Island and the Lower Fraser at this time. (No, no, from Mr. DeCosmos.) I say that the farmers of the Interior have a geographical protection. The time is so distant when agricultural produce can come in to the upper parts of British Columbia or when the produce of the upper country can come into competition with the produce of the Island and of the Lower Fraser in these markets, without feeling the cost of transport as equivalent to a protective duty, that before that time arrives the tariff may be amended again and again. With regard to what has been said about the closer union with a foreign country, I said and I repeat it that if the interests of the farmers would be prejudiced under Confederation, they would be utterly annihilated under Annexation. I believe that if we were brought under the Dominion tariff they would be injured. I did not say that the Dominion would not give us separate tariff regulations. I think they will do so but I say we have put ourselves out of a position to prescribe. We have put before them a scheme, and we have left the tariff out of the scheme. We can now point out that we want protection, and leave it for the Dominion Government to point out the means. We have virtually put it out of our hands to dictate the means approved by this Council. I cannot agree in thinking that clause 91 leaves us free to impose our own tariff. I say we have made the "British North America Act" apply under the scheme which we have adopted under clause 16.

Hon. MR. RING—I differ from that.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—That is the whole strength of my argument. We have virtually given up the power over the tariff to Canada, but it is open to us and the Council are invited to state what is wanted. It must be remembered that those terms are only memoranda for Confederation. Different terms may be sent back, and it will be left for the new Council to decide upon them; and I, for one, am ready to suggest to the Canadian Government that we should have protection, although there are objections, for if you protect one interest another must suffer. We pay for the protection of produce in the increased price of the articles we consume. I go to the length of thinking it desirable to recommend the Canadian Government to protect our agricultural interests.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I will ask the honorable mover of this recommendation whether he insists on the word 'necessary'?

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I say this is one of those things that under Confederation will be necessary.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Will the hon. member alter the word 'necessary' to 'very desirable'?

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—If you retain that word I must vote against it.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I retain the word.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—'Highly desirable' would suit my views better.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—I think the word ought to be retained.

Hon. MR. ALSTON—I believe all restrictions are false in principle, and governments have no right to travel out of their path to dictate principles. It has rightly been said that protection to agriculture is at the expense of other things, and it is simply ridiculous to say that agricultural interests are the only interests in the colony. Vancouver Island cannot be looked upon as an agricultural country. I would vote for protection temporarily, but as soon as good roads are made the farmer needs no protection, and although free trade may be injurious to one interest, I believe it to be the correct principle. It strikes me that the Organic Act is a treaty of partnership between four countries, and where the terms are silent we can alter the Organic Act. If it be that we may make the laws, Canada still takes the revenue; and unless the resolution is altered I cannot vote for it.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I may clear the ground if I make a suggestion. I think it would be better to take the subjects separately, and then I would embody the whole matter in one resolution to His Excellency.

Hon. MR. WOOD—It would be desirable to have an unanimous vote as possible. The Hon. Chief Commissioner and the Hon. Mr. Alston have said that a tax on produce would be likely to prove injurious. I say that protection is only to be extended until our agriculturists can compete with the farmers on the opposite shore. If reciprocity should eventually arise, I do not pledge myself to support protection. It may be necessary then to make some compensation to farmers, but I cannot say I would support it.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—We want a positive guarantee for protection.

Hon. Chief Commissioner moved an amendment to change the word 'necessary' to 'highly desirable.'

The recommendation, as amended, was carried.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS moved a resolution, 'That it is highly desirable that manufactured articles should be protected.'

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I would ask the hon. member to define manufactured articles.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—I would name boots and shoes. Now in event of any reciprocity treaty, I should like to see our interests protected. A reciprocity treaty may exert a stimulating influence for a time or it may

be detrimental. We have confectionary and many other things; for instance, there is a proposition to erect a woollen manufactory. Furniture at present all comes from the United States. Our cabinetmakers could manufacture it here if they could import the raw material free. The same could be said of wheelwrights. If we are to have large public works we must have these interests protected. Harness may be brought in cheap under reciprocity, leather and soap likewise. I start out on this principle, if we can keep our manufactures at home we are doing our duty.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—The Canadian tariff applies to all the articles mentioned by the hon. gentleman; I am mystified in regard to this protection. He says he wants protection for leather, and boots, and harness. Twenty per cent is our tariff on wagons, and yet no class of wagons, such as is wanted, can be made here.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—We shall never have producing manufactures if we do not protect them. With regard to wagon building, parties now engaged in the business were about to leave until the tariff was introduced. Competition lowers the price of home manufactured articles.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I shall support this resolution; the Canadian tariff to some measure meets it.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I shall ask to have the words altered.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—Presently we shall have to protect British Columbian interests against Canadian interests. If the farmer and boot maker are protected, other local manufactures must be protected also. Where you do not produce things admit them free. It is our duty to protect our own interests.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—And turn people out of the country.

Hon. MR. HELMCKEN—You keep them in. You send out \$100,000 a quarter for goods, which ought to be spent here. That \$100,000 ought to be invested in mines and in building up the country. Now you want this country to be a garden and a manufactory. The people must do it, and it is the only way in which they can do it. Put your productions into competition with the whole world and you will ruin the producers throughout the whole colony.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Another question is, up to what point are you to protect? What is the use of protecting produce if you protect colonists out of the country? I put this as an abstract proposition. There is no more moot point than the difference between free trade and protection. I see the Canadian tariff protects these things, and I don't feel inclined to ask for more. Under the Canadian tariff agricultural products are almost free, but manufactures are protected. I don't intend to assume that the tariff will be taken off—that protection is to be taken away from manufactures, for if so, it will be against the arguments of the members from British Columbia.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—Some members are growing protection mad. They want to build a wall around the colony and keep out the entire world. You must come down to first principles. When honorable members talk about protection, I suppose we intend to protect that which we can produce. Are we to protect so as to force people into branches of industry unthought of before? Some honorable members have run to the extent of protecting population out of the colony; another favors protection in order to keep prices low, and thus to secure our population. I maintain that protection has run too far, and the agriculturists have not benefited by it. [No, no! Mr. DeCosmos.] They tell me the demand is so small that prices are less. I am not in favor of withdrawing protection from farmers, but let us see that it doesn't go too far.

Hon. MR. WOOD—Might I not turn the tables by judging some hon. members are free trade mad; no one ever dreamt of such high taxation. So far from sweeping off population we secure it, and in England free trade is intended to benefit the manufactures and it does so. It struck a blow at agriculture, and if they had not gone into raising and spending more money it would have been an utter failure. High price for corn is now unknown; but free trade by way of dogma is absurd.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—There is a distinction between a tariff for protection and a prohibitory tariff. The hon. Collector of Customs will set me right if I am mistaken, but I believe the importation of arms from foreign countries into a colony is prohibited.

Hon. COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—Prohibited, I believe, altogether.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—Precisely so; that the defence of the Colony may never depend on foreign aid. The hon. Chief Commissioner asked the extent of the protection. I say, during the infancy of the Colony. When we are able to run alone protection will be unnecessary. With regard to farmers wanting free trade, I deny it emphatically.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—No doubt the Canadian Government will like this amendment of the tariff.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I shall vote against it because it says it is expedient to arrange it in the terms. If the hon. member alters the wording it would then become on the same footing as the last recommendation.

Hon. Mr. DeCosmos altered the wording accordingly, and on vote the motion was lost.

The motion of hon. Dr. Helmcken was put and carried.

Thursday, 24th March, 1870.

On the House going into Committee of the whole on the Confederation Resolution.

Mr. DeCosmos moved the following resolution:

That in the opinion of this Council it is expedient in order to foster commerce, to admit, duty free, into this colony or some portions thereof certain articles of foreign merchandise not produced in the Dominion or this colony, and that provision for the admission of the same be made in the terms of union with Canada.

In reply to a question the Hon. mover said it would be impossible to name all the articles; but a few of them might be instanced, such as tropical fruits, silks and English dry goods; he thought this the proper time to bring these matters to the attention of the Dominion government, believing that they would listen to them. Some discussion ensued as to the mode in which the different recommendations and resolution were to be taken up.

The Hon. Attorney General called hon. members' attention to the fact, that it had been agreed by the House that an expression of opinion on these general principles; namely as to the protection of agriculture, of manufactures, and of commerce, should be taken, and that as had been very properly suggested by the member for Victoria District, a general resolution should be framed on these abstract views.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I shall offer an amendment, because I think the question of Free Port and Protection should not be dealt with together.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—The proposition of the hon. member for Victoria district is as to what shall be admitted free; the hon. member for New Westminster proposes to suspend the whole tariff.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I stated one reason why I thought it not desirable to put the two together. You cannot get the control of the tariff. I say we want free trade in certain articles, and I say we must have the tariff entirely remodelled as to these articles. My difficulty is that we were last evening discussing protection, and how far we should have the power to deal with it. I moved an amendment which was, I think, the only constitutional way of dealing with the question, and in answering certain propositions of hon. gentlemen yesterday, I endeavoured to deal with protection *per se*. I listened with interest to what fell from the Hon. Commissioner of Customs, and I do not like to set my opinion against his on matters of this kind, on which I know he is an authority, especially when I find him backed by the hon. Attorney General and Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works. I instanced the United States of America, and said that they are a living instance of non-separation of tariff. The hon. Chief Commissioner of Customs did not go so far as to say we could frame a tariff for ourselves, but that the Dominion Government would frame it for us. Now, Sir, I say that we must not run away with any such idea. If we were allowed to have a different scheme of revenue, Newfoundland would ask the same;

New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and other provinces would all ask for exceptional tariffs, and the federal fiscal policy would be broken up and destroyed. Depend upon it we ought not to run away with such an idea. The Dominion government cannot admit of exceptional or differential tariffs any more than the United States can do so. Some hon. members say that we are not under the Organic Act, and need not be under it, unless we choose, that there is a distinction between the relations of the provinces that were confederated under the act, and those that may hereafter come in, and that we can change the Organic Act if we think proper. I admit that any province not prepared to come in under the Organic Act can stop out. The act is not binding on us now, but will be if we go into the Dominion. I am surprised to hear some hon. members speaking lightly of a reciprocity treaty. Look at the single item of coal. We at present only send 18,000 tons per annum to San Francisco. I have no doubt that under a reciprocity treaty, we should supply them with 50,000 tons a year at least, to say nothing of anthracite coal. In the course of a few years, allowing time for trade to develop itself, this would bring in \$900,000 or, say, one million dollars a year into the Colony. Mr. Chairman, we are now speaking of a single item, and that, I believe, not the largest, which would bring in one million a year, and that calculation is based upon the present consumption of coal in San Francisco, and the consumption will no doubt increase. In addition to this, look at the quantity of shipping, and the cheap commodities which these ships bring in, which could hardly be brought as a measure of commerce. There are objectors to reciprocity. No doubt it would be very nice if we could open the United States ports to our goods, and close our ports to their goods. But this would not be reciprocity. There is, in my opinion, only one answer to be given. I say, give the farmers good roads, and this will be protection for them. Now, sir, what does the development of our coal interests mean; it means extension of labor, and circulation of money. Farmers have at once a full demand for their produce. Apply the same argument to lumber. Its development would cause more money to be expended in the colony. Every ton of coal brought to the bank, and every tree cut down, means spending of money. There, then, is another field opened up for what farmers have to sell. Give the farmers this development and good roads, and they would soon find out that reciprocity would be like the handle of a jug, on the side of British Columbia. Depend upon it we will come in under the reciprocity treaty, and the advantages will be so great on our side that it will hardly be reciprocity. Nothing can be more unfair than to suppose we are to have a free market in the United States and they have none here.

Hon. Collector of Customs asked if Mr. Robson had any resolution to propose.

Hon. Mr. Robson said that at present he was replying to remarks that had been made by other hon. gentlemen.

Hon. Attorney General said that the course that the hon. gentleman was pursuing was embarrassing, and would tend to complicate the question before the House, and proceeded to correct a statement which he understood Mr. Robson to have made as to what had fallen from the hon. Chief Commissioner, hon. Mr. Hamley, and himself on a previous occasion as to the right to control tariff being in the Provinces after Union.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—Anyone who knows the history of the United States knows that if any question of dealing with the tariff law in any manner other than federal could arise, it would be in reference to groups of states instead of single states. I say then that we must consider this as a group of Provinces of the Dominion. Many years will probably not elapse before we see groups of States distinguished as Pacific and Atlantic, or East and West and North and South, in the neighboring Republic.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I rise to move a resolution. It is the same as that proposed at the Yale Convention by the hon. member for Victoria District in 1867.

HONS. DR. HELMCKEN and ATTORNEY GENERAL—What Convention? We know of no Convention.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I have a perfect right to allude to what took place at the little Parliament at Yale. I believe this to be the proper way to approach the subject. The resolution which I propose is as follows:

That a respectful address be presented to His Excellency the Governor recommending that the following may be included in the conditions of the proposed terms of union with Canada. If at any time after the admission, the legislature of British Columbia shall pass an address to the Governor-General of Canada declaring that it is expedient to establish a free port in the Pacific in order to advance the interests of British commerce in the North Pacific, the Parliament of the Dominion to make provision for the establishment of the same.

It is astonishing to find what a change has come over the hon. Mr. DeCosmos since he changed his city seat for a rural seat. He is becoming less capable of taking a statesman-like view of these things than he was two years ago. I think by providing that, the new council shall, after due deliberation find it desirable, that a Free Port shall be established in this colony is, after all, the proper way. I cannot think that this House, with the small representative element that it has should be asked to decide this point. I say that the tendency of the Canadian policy is in the direction of free trade. (No, no, from hon. Mr. DeCosmos.) I say it is, and there is a speech of Sir G. E. Cartier recently

published, in which he says that the tendency of Canadian policy is towards free trade. Now I believe that a great British Empire is to be established on this continent,—the Greater Britain; and I believe that all British manufactures will be admitted free. If Great Britain takes her true part in pushing forward this Empire, she will naturally expect some advantages; she will naturally look for some immediate financial result. Every unproductive laborer in England is a tax upon the others; but transfer them to the Dominion and they will become producers and consumers. I believe it to be of the first importance that there should be a free port here. By a free port I do not mean that everything should necessarily be admitted free. There is no reason why local industries and especially agricultural interests should not continue to enjoy substantial protection. I believe the Canadian Government will readily realize the advantages of the policy of having a free port on the Pacific. There could be no local jealousies growing out of it. The provinces on the Atlantic could not object. Our free port would attract commerce and wealth to the nation which they could not possibly attract, and thus enrich the nation and reflexly benefit all. I maintain that while the larger advantages would be local, the general advantages would be very considerable. I was gratified in reading a leading article in the *Ottawa Times*, the organ of the Dominion Government, in which the theory of a free port for the Dominion on the Pacific is strongly and ably advocated, and this article forms a complete answer to those who allege that the Canadian statesmen would never listen to any such proposition. If it should be decided that a free port would conduce to the interests of the Province and, consequently, to the interest of the Dominion, why should not we have it? Why should we object? What more glorious idea can there be than that of a British Empire extending across the Continent, with its back to the North Pole, with its face looking Southward. I will not venture to say how far; with one foot planted on the Atlantic and the other on the Pacific, stretching out one hand to Europe and the other to Asia, and inviting commerce of both hemispheres to enter its wide open portals, free as the wind that fills the canvas. Depend upon it, Sir, if this is to be the true north-west passage, the gates must be thrown open. Let us not repel commerce, but woo it. I venture to think that the resolution which I have the honor to offer proposes to deal with the matter in the most statesman-like way; and I trust it will commend itself to the judgment, and receive the support of all parties in the House.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—Whilst believing that the establishment of a free port at Victoria might be beneficial to the interests of the Lower Fraser; did not think it would be for the general good of the Colony. In his opinion the agricultural interests wanted protection; for the present he must vote against the hon. member for New West-

minster. He thought that such questions ought to be left to the Dominion Government.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—After the very, I will not say unusual, but unexpected remarks in reference to myself, I must crave the indulgence of the House whilst I say a few words to set myself right. Sir, I had something to do with the Yale Convention, and I am not ashamed of my connection with it; my political standard was unfurled then as it is to-day. When I first entered upon politics in this country I established a high political standard, which would take the measure of a political trickster as well as that of a statesman. There is nothing in the conduct of the hon. member for New Westminster either here or at Yale to entitle him to the name of statesman. I say, sir, that I am as free as I was at Yale to vote for that clause, and if it can be got into the terms I will vote for it. I brought the question up at Yale because I knew that there was a party in Victoria favorable to free port, and I wished to see the question fought out after Confederation not before. The hon. gentleman was defeated; he could not get the Yale Convention to endorse the retaining of the Assay Office at New Westminster, and he took his defeat very much to heart. (Hon. Mr. Robson—Untrue, untrue). The hon. member for Yale came to me and said: "You concede this point as to the Assay Office and I will yield the free port. We don't want Mr. Robson to leave." That's how it came to be in the Yale resolutions. Since to this Colony I came I have never swerved from protection. In the first article I wrote for a newspaper in this Colony the word "protection" occurs. I want to see the Canadian revenue laws extended here; I want to see power in the local government to protect the industrial interests of the colony. I would like to know who has changed the hon. gentleman's opinions. I spent my time and money in getting protection. I challenged a gentleman on the floor of this House to retire and I did retire, I hoisted the flag of protection and won.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—I wish to state that what the hon. gentleman said was true, except that he mistook the Hon. Mr. Robson for hon. Mr. Holbrook.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—We are here to remedy evils likely to occur from Confederation, evils which are admitted by every member of this council. That there is an evil even the hon. member for New Westminster has admitted. (Hon. Mr. Robson—No!) The hon. gentleman makes his net so wide that he slips through; but he said in effect that the difficulty was irremediable and to get out of it he proposes not general free trade but free trade in certain special articles. If the Canadian Government can agree to one they can to the other. I believe that if we show the Canadian Government that the Canadian Tariff would be an evil, they will find means to remove the evil. I believe a tariff fair and suitable to this colony will be made. I believe we have

gone so far right; we have resolved that our agriculture shall be protected. Now comes the question as to commerce: We want articles of commerce as cheap as possible; our trade is chiefly retail, nevertheless it is important and should be fostered. I think that everything we can do to increase the population of this country is of importance, I therefore propose this resolution:

That in the opinion of this council it is advisable that after union foreign manufactured articles in which trade can be carried on with neighboring countries shall be admitted into this colony at a low nominal rate of duty, and generally the tariff should be made to suit the commercial condition of the colony.

I think free trade in Vancouver Island would be beneficial with protection to agriculturalists, but I do not think it desirable except in a limited way. Does anyone imagine that if free port was restored to Victoria her prosperity would return? In more early days, when she enjoyed free port, there were not the obstructions to free trade with the neighboring country that there are at present. Now there are Custom House officers to prevent smuggling and a great deal of illicit trade is checked. With regard to free trade: In former days we were far more advanced than the people on the Sound; to-day, on the Sound, trade has so far increased as to be almost equally as good and I am told you can buy goods almost as cheaply as in Victoria, so I do not believe free port would restore our pristine prosperity. Under free trade it is supposed that large stocks of goods will come by Panama or by long sea route. But look at the altered condition of things resulting from the Pacific railway and the railway to Columbia River, and probably on to Puget Sound. Do you imagine anyone will send large stocks of goods to lie here? and will not people telegraph for whatever they may require, and bring them across the continent by railway? I say that the same prosperity and trade that we enjoyed before would not come back. We are told that when the railway is made Asiatic trade will come across, but I doubt the railway being made in our time, and if it is, ships will go wherever the railway terminus is and that will not be here. It would be an advantage to have some articles free, silks, tric tracs, &c. Make Victoria the Paris of the coast and we may do something. And this brings me to the observation of my hon. friend on my right, that more frequent steam communication with the Sound would be productive of much good to trade. What I want to say is that the persons going to negotiate these terms ought to be able to state that this colony requires restrictions in the tariff. I do not intend to be factious, but I do intend to show to the Canadian Government what we consider best for this country, and that without certain terms we believe Confederation will be bad. What use is it to attempt to deceive

Canada? She knows what is being done, and if not there are those here who would tell her. It is our duty to show the Canadian Government that there are things we desire. Of what use is the country to Canada unless it is populated. She wants people, not terms. We must show what will be the advantages of Confederation. If the Tariff of the Dominion must come here it will be unsuitable to us—an admitted evil. If this cannot be remedied Confederation is likely to be put off for years. I merely mean to elicit the feeling of this House on the subject of whether we can take off certain duties. If commerce can be protected in the way we desire, as we shall see when the persons who go to arrange the terms come back, then it will be no use to oppose Confederation; if the evil is still to exist, then there will be opposition.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—I shall vote against the resolution. With regard to free port I do not say I am opposed to it or in favor of it; but I do say that the Canadians will say if we pass this resolution, "What kind of people are these that pass a resolution yesterday in favor of protection, and to-day desire free port?" The honorable member for Victoria city proved forcibly, I will not say conclusive, that free port would not be beneficial. His reasoning is inconsistent, and it is eminently characteristic of the honorable gentleman.

Hon. MR. HELMCKEN—I desire to explain the terms of my resolution—the latter part. If the Canadian tariff rules our farmers are ruined.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—Vancouver Island can never be an agricultural country.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—Bring the Canadian tariff here and you take away protection and tax the farmers for all they consume.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS—A free port is an impossibility unless the English Parliament repeal the Act of Union. This act enacts that British Columbia tariff laws shall prevail.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I believe a free port could be carried on if you could wall in an acre or two of this city and not do any injury to manufacturing interests or any other interests. I mean to say that upon that acre people might expose their goods—make it one large bonded warehouse.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—We have heard of the pernicious effects in prospective of the Canadian tariff. I maintain that it will protect the principal, that is the pastoral interests, better than what is proposed by some honorable members. The admission of cereals free will be counterbalanced by the additional protection afforded to the farmers' horses and cattle and the cheaper rate for goods.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I wished to gather the opinion of this House before expressing my opinion on this question. I regret much and am sure that this House will join with me in a feeling of regret, that my honorable colleague, the Chief Commis-

sioner of Lands and Works, is, unfortunately, absent from his place on account of indisposition, for I am aware that this is a subject to which he has given much consideration and I would have been glad that the House should have had the benefit of his opinion on this very serious question, for it is impossible to approach the subject without feeling its vital importance, and I think it would tax our united will and energy to their utmost limits, if we had the power to frame a tariff which would be suitable; therefore I see wisely in all the resolutions a wide generality. Upon this question of tariff we must especially avoid attempting to commit the Dominion Government to any fixed principle. The tariff cannot be part of the terms, but it is undoubtedly a matter of consideration to be urged on the Canadian Government. Though we have assented to the Organic Act we have not shut ourselves out from going to the Dominion Parliament to ask for remedies which they can give to us, and to ask them to find a remedy which will make confederation acceptable to this colony. Therefore I think, with the honorable Chief Commissioner, that one general resolution upon this subject, after dealing with the three separate resolutions or abstract principles, may with advantage be passed by this House. I think, also, with that honorable gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that Canadian statesmen who will have to deal with this matter will do so with wisdom. They in considering the terms when other provinces have entered the confederation must have experienced some of these difficulties which now come to us for the first time. No doubt many hon. members of this House have given great consideration to this question, yet I think that Canadian experience will help us. Much has been said on Free Port, much for and against. My own tendencies, since first I had a seat on this floor, in another assembly, have been in favor of free port. I voted for it then, but I feel that I am obliged to vote against it now. The Imperial Government will not sanction anything which is in effect a differential duty in the same tariff, but this is distinct from the question of a separate tariff for British Columbia. Other considerations will naturally strike Canada and I think if free port was made a *SINE QUA NON* she would refuse Confederation altogether, as she would not like to run the risk of entering into difficulties and dispute of a fiscal character with her great and powerful neighbor, which might possibly arise out of smuggling. Another difficulty to dealing with this matter that we have to encounter is that we have information that a reconstruction of the Canadian tariff is at present going on, and there is some chance of a reciprocity treaty being arranged, therefore we cannot put forward any fixed principles. The main objections of the Dominion to a separate tariff, it strikes me, will be found to be: first, that they are afraid of infringing a principle; and, second, the formation of a precedent for a special tariff, which might

cause Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and other Provinces to ask for special tariffs to suit their particular circumstances and to avoid the inconvenience of possible hostile tariffs. There are certainly many plausible reasons to be found in favor of a special tariff for British Columbia. Such as the difficulty of communication, the want of either road or railway and the security against smuggling into Canada. But the probability is that protection to commerce would be secured by the reconstruction of the Canadian tariff, and I regard the framing of a tariff now which would apply satisfactorily to our altered circumstances under such a thorough change as Confederation would bring, as a matter of impossibility. Formerly, when there was a free port at Victoria, it was always in danger, and the hon. senior member for Victoria City, then the Speaker of the Vancouver Island House of Assembly, was always afraid of every little impost on stock or produce lest it should infringe upon the principle of free trade, and at last it was so loaded with dues and charges that before the union the principle of free port was destroyed. But I see no reason why, when we are going into a partnership, we should not arrange the best terms we can and I think that the differences could be altered in favor of this colony, and in favor of Confederation generally. We have no power ourselves; that is the reason this question is not brought up in the terms. We must see what effect union will have on this colony first—we must see how the thing works before we decide finally. At the same time we must take care that we protect such important interests as agriculture and commerce from haste or injurious delay. I will, therefore, as soon as the terms are settled propose a resolution which will meet this difficulty and give time to see what change, if any, the country may require. In sending our resolutions to the Canadian Government we must not suppose that we have exhausted the subject. Many points must arise when the Canadian commissioners come here, or ours go there—if the matter takes that turn—but we should be careful not to overload the terms lest we should endanger the cause of Confederation altogether. We must have some faith in the Dominion Government—in Canada and Canadian Statesmen. We must not forget that their own interests would be ours. I say nothing with regard to the latter part of the resolution of the hon. member for Victoria City except that it does not accord with his usual statesmanlike views. I shall offer no opposition to the latter part of the resolution of the hon. member but I cannot support the whole. If anyone will move an amendment to leave out the latter part, I will support it.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—We have three propositions now before the House; my own, and those of the hon. members for Victoria and New Westminster; the former divides the subject. I think they would both act judiciously if they withdrew the question of free port.

Hon. Dr. Carrall moved an amendment to strike out the latter part of the resolution of hon. member for Victoria.

Hon. Mr. Ring suggested that the amendment should be deferred. These amendments so qualify the general principles that I must decline voting for any one of them.

Hon. MR. WOOD—Sir, I do not intend to express my opinion on free trade or protection but I intend to vote; and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Ring) might consider that he is not pledged to any particular course by his vote. I give my vote in order that the question may be brought before the Canadian Government, and ultimately before the people of this colony.

Hon. MR. RING—I have great respect for the opinion of the hon. and learned gentleman, but the resolution of the hon. member for New Westminster pledges us to the Organic Act, which I decline to endorse. We are entitled to our own free port and to the regulation of our own tariff.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I hope the hon. member will remain while I set him right. My resolution only asks that a Representative Council here, after due deliberation shall have power to decide upon this question. I consider that the name of free port is attractive; this, under the resolution of the hon. member for Victoria District, we should lose. We must not regard the Canadian tariff as entirely unprotective. It is wrong, it is untrue to state that the Canadian tariff is such a great evil, and I maintain that it would not be an evil, but an actual good, but that is no reason we should not seek to make it a greater good.

The Clerk read the resolution of hon. DeCosmos, the amendment of hon. Robson, the amendment of hon. Helmcken, and the amendment of hon. Carrall.

By the leave of the Committee the amendment of the hon. Mr. Robson was withdrawn, in order that it might be brought up as a substantive motion.

On a division the motion of hon. Dr. Carrall was carried, and the original resolution of Mr. DeCosmos was lost.

The hon. Mr. Robson then moved his resolution, to which the hon. Mr. Humphreys moved an amendment.

Amendment and resolution were lost.

Hon. MR. DRAKE—Sir, I rise to move this resolution on Excise:

That in the opinion of this Council the duties of Excise levied upon malsters and brewers under the excise laws of Canada would be detrimental if made applicable to British Columbia, and that His Excellency be requested to take such steps as he may deem advisable for the interest of this colony, and further to take care that no export duties shall be charged on spars exported from British Columbia.

And I would remark in doing so that excise as levied under the Canadian system, is very heavy indeed; there is duty, license

and excise. The result would be to the brewing interests in all probability total extinction; for on an increasing trade the duty would be so high as to check trade in this direction. The other part of the resolution is in respect to logs, the duty on which is \$1 per 1000 on saw logs, but whether a spar or a mast it is regarded still as a log. Thus the Canadian tariff would seriously interfere with our industry and interfere with getting out masts and spars.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—I think the hon. and learned member for Victoria city is under a misapprehension when he includes spars with logs. If 'logs' refers simply to saw-logs, I cannot see that the spar business would be affected.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I must confess, sir, that I do not see the object of this clause. I don't think there is any need for alarm. I have lived for some years in Canada, and when I think of the Canadian statesmen who will look at British Columbia without regard to party politics, such men, for instance, as Sir J. A. Macdonald, Sir Francis Hincks, Sir A. T. Galt, Mr. George Brown, and the various statesmen accustomed to deal with these things I feel confident that we are safe in their hands; therefore I hope that the hon. and learned member will not imagine that in voting against this motion we are voting against the interests he so properly wishes to protect.

Hon. MR. RING—The hon. Attorney General seems to think that these honorable men may live forever. He forgets that in the progress of time other men will take the lead in public affairs.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—It is a most important question. The Canadian Government ought to know what we think of it. The brewing interest would disappear, and it is large in proportion to our population, and to ruin it would be doing an injury. I hope the hon. Attorney General will withdraw his opposition and let this recommendation go with the others to the Governor that he may forward it with them to the Canadian Government. At the time the Organic Act was made it related to contiguous Provinces. The hon. Attorney General says they may not put it in force here for ten, twenty, or thirty years. Granted, but it may also be put in force immediately. I say, then, let the Canadian Government be made aware that the application of the excise laws to this colony will be detrimental to its interests.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—I think the hon. member loses sight of one fact. He is terribly afraid of the Canadian tariff, but he loses sight of the fact that barley comes in duty free. I believe the whole system will be carefully revised, and it is absurd to hamper the terms of the resolution for such a petty question.

Hon. MR. DRAKE—In reply, I think our duty in coming here is to protect the interests of the colony. We ask the Dominion Government to consider these things. We do not insist on terms being inserted. I do not ask for this only, I desire to draw the

attention of the Canadian Government to these interests that they may not be overlooked. As to these interests being petty and small, that is our misfortune; but let us not lose sight of them for that reason. As for Americans coming here to cut down our logs, I say let them come. If I can alter my resolution to suit the Attorney General I will do it.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—If I thought the interests of the colony would suffer I would consent to bring the subject before the Canadian Government, but I think we have nothing to fear.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—If you ruin the brewing interest, you inflict much harm in other ways. Brewers consume one million pounds of barley yearly. This is 7,000 acres of land which must be cultivated. To ruin this will throw out of employment a large number of people and, close up our breweries.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—I see no objection to sending this up, but not to make it a *SINE QUA NON*. I believe the Canadian Government will protect all these interests. Brewing is not of sufficient magnitude to kill Confederation.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I must oppose if logs are left in. I think it may be our duty to protect spars and logs.

Hon. MR. DRAKE—Then I will strike out logs and leave spars.

The Clerk then read hon. Mr. Drake's motion, as altered. Carried.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—There are other things to be considered.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I think it is now competent for me to move the resolution proposed by the hon. Chief Commissioner.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—Is it intended that this shall swamp all the others?

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—No, it relates only to tariff:

RESOLVED, that this Council respectfully represent to His Excellency the Governor that in negotiating the terms of union of British Columbia with Canada, it is of the first importance to point out to the Government of the Dominion that the circumstances of this colony are in many respects so different from those of the Eastern Provinces that the application of the present Canadian tariff to this colony, while reducing the aggregate burden of taxation, would injuriously affect the agricultural and commercial interests of this community, and that it be therefore urgently impressed upon that Government that it is absolutely necessary to our well-being under Confederation that special rates of Customs duties and special Customs regulations be arranged for this colony in such manner as may be found practically most advisable, so as to secure, while our requirements in this re-

spect remain as at present an equal measure of protection to our agricultural products and of facility to commerce, as are provided under the existing British Columbia tariff.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

The original motion of the hon. Mr. Decosmos on the Orders of the Day was read and by leave withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. Drake's motion was also withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. Holbrook's motion was put and lost.

Hon. Mr. Robson's motion was put and lost.

Hon. Mr. Humphreys moved,

That in the consideration of the subsidies to be given by Canada to this colony due weight shall be given to the advisability of abolishing the present road tolls on the Yale Cariboo road, and also to make provision for funds to keep the same in repair.

I put this in consequence of the suggestions thrown out by the hon. Chief Commissioner. I think these road tolls have done more towards making bankrupts than any over-trading. They are main trunk roads, and I think they ought to be kept up by the Dominion Government.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I am not aware that that is the result of a suggestion of the hon. Chief Commissioner. I am aware of his views, and I believe he has doubts as to whether roads can be maintained by a Government so far removed as Canada.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—I would suggest that this be laid over till the hon. Chief Commissioner be here.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—The hon. Chief Commissioner would not object to any conclusion of the House on this matter. But I caution hon. members not, by the addition of these suggestions, so to overload the resolutions as to break down the whole of them.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—I move that the Committee rise and report progress, in order that the matter may be laid over until the hon. Chief Commissioner is in his place.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Friday, 25th March, 1870.

On Mr. Humphrey's motion on roads being read the Hon. Attorney General said:

I regret to say that my honorable colleague, the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works is still too much indisposed to attend to his place in this House. I would, therefore, suggest that the honorable member should postpone this notice until he is present.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—I have no objection to defer it on the understanding that it comes up on Monday.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—On Monday, or this day, if the Committee get through with their other motions on confederation.

Hon. MR. RING—I desire to introduce a motion with regard to free port, but I do not intend to inflict upon the House a speech. I move that His Excellency be respectfully requested to place in the terms a clause to restore to Victoria the system of free port antecedent to confederation. The honorable member for New Westminster was indignant with me yesterday for not supporting his resolution. I only say that his proposition was hypocritical. I ask that we may have free port restored before confederation. We have now the right to legislate for ourselves on this point. Hereafter we shall be at the mercy of the Canadian Parliament at Ottawa. I would make free port one of the conditions of confederation, but first restore free port.

On the Clerk reading the first words of the resolution.—

Hon. DR. CARRALL—I rise to a point of order. I say that this question has been already decided.

CHAIRMAN—I think the honorable member for Nanaimo is not out of order on that point. The question of free port yesterday related to free port after confederation. The resolution of the honorable member for Nanaimo is in reference to free port antecedent to confederation.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—The honorable member is surely out of order, this Committee having met to consider confederate resolutions.

CHAIRMAN—I rule that the Hon. Mr. Ring is in order, as his resolution refers to the terms of confederation now before this committee. On the honorable Mr. Ring's motion being put to vote it was lost.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—I have very great pleasure in bringing this resolution forward with reference to the Indian tribes.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I ask the indulgence of the honorable member whilst I introduce a few words. On a former occasion a very evil impression was introduced in the Indian mind on the occasion of Sir James Douglas' retirement. I ask the honorable gentleman to be cautious, for Indians do get information of what is going on.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—My motion is to ask for protection for them under the change of government. The Indians number four to one white man, and they ought to be considered. They should receive protection.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—These are the words that do harm. I would ask the honorable Magisterial member from New Westminster to consider.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—I say they shall be protected. I speak of Indians of my own neighborhood, on the Lower Fraser.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I rise to a point of privilege. I think that the warning of the Hon. Attorney General is necessary. This is the sort of discussion which does harm.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—Don't report it.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—I do not view it in that way. I say that the Indians of the

Lower Fraser are intelligent, good settlers. I ask that they receive the same protection under confederation as now.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—I would ask what protection they have now.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—They have protection in being allowed to occupy land, and they enjoy equally with white people the protection of the law, and I ask the House to keep them in the same position.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—If the Indians had no better protection than the Hon. Magistrate from New Westminster, I should not envy them their protection. The honorable gentleman must have forgotten the direction of the Imperial Government to his Excellency the Governor in Lord Granville's despatch.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—The Hon. Mr. Holbrook has told you that he speaks in behalf of 40,000 Indians. I speak in the name of 65,000. I am inclined to think we should not pass this matter over entirely, we ought to point out our desire that the Indians should be cared for. Now, the Canadian Indian policy has been characterized as good, even by American statesmen. Our own policy is not worth the name. I consider it to be a blot on the Government. I will, therefore, propose as an amendment the following:

That the Indian policy of Canada shall be extended to this colony immediately upon its admission into the Dominion, and that the necessary agencies and appliances for an efficient administration of Indian affairs may be at once established.

The Canadian Government occupies the position of guardians to Indians. They are treated as minors. There is a perfect net work of Indian agents in Canada, and through them the Indians are made presents of agricultural implements, seeds and stock. Now, if we let it go forth to the Indians that their interests are being considered, and that this will be greatly to their advantage, I say, by making the Indians feel all this, there will be less danger of exciting any unpleasant feeling among them. We should let the Indian mind at rest and let them feel that Confederation will be a greater boon to them than to the white population.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—I rise to state my intention of voting against the resolution and the amendment. We have the full assurance in Lord Granville's despatch that the Indians must be protected. I do think the honorable gentlemen are only helping up resolutions trusting to overload the whole system. The honorable member for New Westminster has affirmed how good the Canadian system is. The goodness of that system is in itself sufficient to render the resolution needless. I shall, therefore, vote against it and the amendment.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—I must vote against the amendment.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—I disapprove of what both the honorable members stated. These gentlemen know nothing of the question. I will show you why. Take away the

Indians from New Westminster, Lillooet, Lytton, Clinton, and these towns would be no where. I say the Indians are not treated fairly by us, and all they want is fair dealing from the white population. At Lillooet I was told there were upwards of 16,000; and \$17,000 gold dust was purchased from Indians. Take away this trade and the towns must sink. I say, send them out to reservations and you destroy trade, and if the Indians are driven out we had all best go too.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—The honourable member for Lillooet says that the Canadian policy will ruin the country and the Indians. I say, then to be consistent, he must move an amendment that it shall not apply. To say that the Canadian policy will ruin the country shows simple ignorance.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—I am convinced that the Hon. Attorney General is right.

Hon. MR. ALSTON—I must support the honorable member for New Westminster. I say there is no Indian policy here, and I am sure that the Canadian policy is good.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I was induced to put an amendment because there is a resolution, otherwise I would not have interfered.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—My esteemed colleague, the Hon. Registrar General, says we have no Indian policy. I say our policy has been, let the Indians alone. (Hon. Mr. Alston—No, no!)

Hon. MR. BARNARD—The reason I ask for the withdrawal of the resolution is that we cannot keep back from the Indians anything that happens here, and it will have a bad effect.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—As these words may go forth, I wish to state on behalf of the Government that the care of the Indians will be the first care of the Imperial Government and of the local Government.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—I do not apprehend any danger from any discussion in this House.

Hon. MR. ALSTON—I suggest the withdrawal of the resolution.

Hon. MR. CARRALL—I say that the Canadian policy has caused them to grow and prosper. I am at a loss to understand why honorable members should be afraid to trust to it.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—The honorable member for Cariboo seems to find it difficult to understand my position. I think it right to endeavor to get the best terms we can, and to point out difficulties. It is the duty of every man to do so. I am perfectly willing to sit here and make the best terms possible. When they come back from Canada it will be time enough for me to decide whether or not I shall support confederation. I am now anti-confederate, but I may become confederate if the terms are good. I say if the Indians are to be stuck in reservations there will be a disturbance. I think, sir, that it will be well that there should be some opposition.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I wish to state I will withdraw my amendment if the honorable member will withdraw his motion.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—I can not do so consistently with my duty.

The amendment was withdrawn.

The resolution of the Hon. Mr. Holbrook was lost by a vote of 20 to 1.

Hon. Mr. Robson moved that an address be presented to his Excellency the Governor, asking that Canada shall cause a geological survey of this colony to be made, commencing within one year after union. He said that a fund of \$100,000 had been set apart by the Canadian Government for the specific object of carrying out a systematic geological survey; that sum to be spread over a period of five years. Canada had the good fortune to possess a very efficient geological staff. The Red River country had received the first year's survey under that arrangement and would probably receive the second this year. British Columbia will possess a greater mineral interest than any other province, and a thorough geological survey will be of the utmost importance to her, and reflexly to Canada, and it was not too much to expect such a survey to follow close upon union.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I am sure no one can have the slightest objection to support a motion for a survey. I assure you it has not escaped the notice of Government, but I regard it as a matter of certainty that British Columbia will come in for her share. I do not object to the consideration of the question between this Government and that of Canada, but I do object to inserting it in the terms. I think it may lead to the danger of the Canadian Government saying, when other things come to be considered, "You don't want this, it is not mentioned in the terms; had you really required this it would scarcely have been omitted in terms so full as these."

Hon. MR. ROBSON—In reply, I say that the Government has inserted a number of special things in the terms; and with reference to the geological survey, I believe Newfoundland got this very matter inserted under the direction of Governor Musgrave.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—I rise to support the motion. I cannot understand the opposition. (Hon. Attorney General—I don't oppose; divide, divide, divide.) I desire to show the necessity for a geological survey. We are now eleven years old as a colony, and nothing is hardly known of the country. We are behind our neighbors of the United States. In California there is a Geological Surveyor, who has to explore and publish the result of his survey. We should have something of the sort here, and in addition, a record of the number of available acres of land in the colony. If 25 or 30 farmers arrived here I would undertake to affirm they could not get any information from the Land Office as to where they could settle down.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I should not like that statement to get abroad uncontradicted. I think these assertions should not be made; they are likely to do much harm. I should like to see the 25 or 30 farmers come; let them go to the Mouth of the Fraser. There may be some difficulty about getting land in any part or locality, but it is absurd to bring up this fuss about the Land Office.

The resolution was put to the vote and carried.

Dr. Helmcken moved that it is desirable that the Dominion Government shall maintain telegraphic communication with this colony.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—It is absolutely necessary that there should be some telegraphic communication with the outer world. It is palpable that we must have it with the seat of Government.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—It will be in the recollection of some of the hon. members that, some years ago, a question was sent out for discussion from the Secretary of State as to the payment by Vancouver Island of a subsidy towards the Transcontinental Line of Telegraph. She could not afford it. Canada has the wire now taken over from the Hudson Bay Company. I shall support the resolution. I do not regard it as a *SINE QUA NON*, but very essential. I have no doubt Canada will do it.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I understood the hon. member for Victoria city intended to ask the Canadian Government to maintain the existing telegraph line which runs through a foreign country.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—From the general wording of the resolution I am at a loss to know what is meant. I think this is a matter which had best be left out, or we shall be overloading the terms. If I vote against it, it is because we have truly too much on the terms.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—Why did not the terms come down to us more perfect?

Hon. DR. CARRALL—I am sorry the resolutions did not come down more perfect, but if they had been ever so perfect hon. members would have found fault. I look upon the conduct of hon. members, in bringing forward the additional resolutions as being inimical to Confederation.

Hon. MR. RING—I shall support the resolution. I think our cure will enhance our value in the estimation of Canada.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—It is admitted that if we are to have union we must have telegraphic communication. Why it was left out I don't know. It must have slipped out for it was before the Executive. Surely hon. members will not have the idea that \$3000 or \$4000 inserted here will stop Confederation.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—\$3000 or \$4000?

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—At present, yes. The only means of communication is through America.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—I thought this was a trans-continental telegraph. I am sorry I said anything about it.

The Chairman then put the motion, which on division was lost.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—When I first rose to address this House on the question of Confederation, I made some passing allusions to nation-making. Now, sir, I believe we are engaged in that great work. Our posterity will, I believe control the northern end of this continent for a thousand generations. We find the American continent in the possession of two nations. The northern part in the possession of the Anglo-Saxon race and the southern part in the possession of the Spanish race: Then again we find the Anglo-Saxon race in the north divided into two nations, with a great mission before them. The first object of the great nation to the south of us may, perhaps, be said to be the acquisition of territory, and they have a united piece of territory from our boundary to Mexico. With regard to the northern Anglo-Saxon race to which we belong, we find that they possess all to the north except Alaska. If the United States have a single and compact piece of territory to the south, we want the same in the north. Look at history as regards the acquisition of territory by nations: Lorraine by France, Poland by Russia, Scotland by England, Texas and Alaska by the United States. How has this been brought about but by a national policy. For hundreds of years it was the policy of France to acquire Lorraine; so it was with Russia and Poland. It has been said that republics cannot have a national policy as monarchies can; I say that they have a policy with regard to land. And I say that we should have a policy of the same kind. Let us lay down this principle, that we intend to create a great nation, and intending to do so, we should have all territory north of the United States. I have no objection to the United States gaining territory to the south, but I do object to her coming north to holding Alaska. Let us glance at Alaska for one moment. The country is similar to our own. It has coal, fish and lumber as we have, and its contiguity to our country ought to induce us to believe that there is a natural alliance between us. We all know how much the purchase of this piece of territory cost the United States in hard cash. Then its annual cost is nearly two million dollars, or forty millions to support it as a United States Territory for 25 years. Then look at the population, a mere nothing; and its revenue, hardly worth taking into account. It is said by many that America is sick of her bargain, and that Russia sold the United States. I think this is a favorable time to bring it up. Canada can well afford to pay for an extended frontier on the Pacific Coast. If we purchased Alaska the Americans could still come in to fish and gather furs, so commercially there need be no difficulty. I believe we could get along smoothly, therefore I have to move this resolution:

That Canada shall purchase the Territory of Alaska, if possible.

I hope, sir, in all our relations for the future we shall remain international not national.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—I rise to support the resolution of the hon. Mr. DeCosmos. The only objection I can see is that perhaps it is a little premature. That Canada will ultimately require it, I can have no doubt. In supposing that the acquisition of this territory, and the consequent hemming in of British Columbia, would have the effect of leading the people of Canada to believe in the ultimate destiny of the British American possessions being drawn into annexation or absorption, the hon. W. H. Seward made an egregious blunder; he did it in his ignorance of the Canadian character. It is not necessary for Canadians to get up and show their loyalty daily, they are ready and able to occupy their position of IMPERIUM IN IMPERIO. There may be some people in Canada who do not like the government. In what country are there not some uneasy spirits? The United States has them, and England is not free from them. I shall decidedly support the hon. member although, I think he is perhaps a little in advance of American statesmen as to the acquisition of territory.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—I think Mr. Seward understood what he was about when he elected the purchase of Alaska. I feel convinced that the government of the United States will not consent to let us have it. I have a strong feeling in favor of the United States, and am satisfied that they should have Alaska. I don't think Canada can afford to re-purchase the territory; nor do I think she has men to pit against the intellectual giants of America. I think the hon. member for Victoria District has perpetrated a joke on this Council; I shall, however, support his motion.

Hon. MR. RING—I rise to support the motion of the hon. member for Victoria District.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I think this is a subject of too great importance to be disposed of hastily. It ought to be fully discussed. I agree with the hon. member for Victoria District that such is desirable, but I also agree with the hon. member for Cariboo, that it is somewhat premature. I think the people of the United States would like to get rid of it, would be rather glad to back out of it. Their policy is to let it 'paddle its own canoe'. If we wait it will probably fall into our hands. If we are to make a suggestion as to the acquisition of territory we should not confine ourselves to Alaska only. Let us have Maine also. It impinges upon Canada on the Atlantic; and it is a portion of land out of which England allowed herself to be cheated. It is well known that Maine is most important as giving an open winter seaboard to Canada; a large portion of Canadian trade has had to pass through Maine in bond. I believe the Dominion of Canada

will eventually utterly absorb America. (Laughter.) Some may laugh, but that is my conviction. The United States have made great progress, but the Constitution is very defective. It cannot bear the creation of another nation, especially one of such a liberal and enlightened constitution as the Dominion of Canada, alongside of it. One of two things is perfectly certain to my mind; that the Dominion will absorb the United States, or that they will meet as one nation, each giving up something. I think it is contrary to nature that they should continue separate. I believe that so great will be the success of the new British North American Empire, that it will absorb all the English speaking people on this continent. The people of Maine desire to belong to Canada, and have done so for years. If, on the Pacific, the Dominion acquires Alaska, and the State of Maine on the Atlantic, I assert that the great destiny of the Empire is assured. I move that the State of Maine be included.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—All we lack now is a Leech or Douglas Jerrold. I think we shall immortalize ourselves; probably we shall appear in Punch. I think Mr. Seward won't blame us.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I must move an amendment. We shall be absorbed before this absorption can take place. I shall move to leave out the words 'if possible.' I think the frog has swollen to the size of an ox.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—These debates should be carried on with becoming gravity.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I think so too, and I think it would be the duty of any Leech amongst us to secure a correct sketch of the movers of the resolution and amendments.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—I think the hon. Attorney General should give his opinion. The words "if possible," on vote, were struck out.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—Shall the words "State of Maine" be included?

Several members—Yes, yes.

The motion "That Canada shall purchase the Territory of Alaska and the State of Maine" was carried.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—Mr. Chairman, as there is no further resolution before the Committee except my own upon roads, I shall, without further words, move its adoption.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—I think it unwise to hamper these conditions, but I consider this an important question. I am here to protest on behalf of persons who pay road tolls. The excuse made for this imposition is that the colony is indebted for the construction of these roads. People have looked to Confederation to relieve them of the \$4 per barrel duty upon flour, which they have been paying for so long. I desire to move an amendment to strike out the Douglas road, as I believe it to be unnecessary. I know that the upper country people will raise their voices against the continuance of the Road Tolls.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—The question was alluded to by myself when the terms were under discussion. I think the roads, if not national, ought to be local. I think the matter ought to be approached differently in dealing with this road. I think that shortly this plank in the platform of terms will be useless, because the railway will span the distance if Confederation is granted upon the terms proposed; therefore, I do not see the wisdom of handing them over to Canada. I think it desirable that road tolls should be abolished, and that we must have something to compensate us for giving them up.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I cannot assent to either the original motion or the amendment. I premise by saying the matter has received considerable consideration. The original resolution, which was suggested by the hon. Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, took up this whole matter. I am sorry the House has not adjourned to give him an opportunity to explain his views upon this question. His opinion is that the road from Yale to Cariboo would not be so well managed by the government at Ottawa as by the local government. The hon. member for Yale says that there are no reasons for road tolls. There is one, as stated by the hon. Chief Commissioner. It is being continually improved; therefore, a road of that description ought to carry with it a road toll for its construction and maintenance as a matter of principle, even after the original cost is paid.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS, with the consent of the House, withdrew his resolution in order to make some verbal alterations to it.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—I shall move the same amendment as I moved to the former resolution. I will read it:

That the government be requested to insert in the terms of Confederation to be proposed to Canada some such clause as the following: All public roads and property of British Columbia at the time of admission to belong to British Columbia, except such public works and property as shall properly belong to the Dominion under the British North America Act; and such portions of the main trunk line through British Columbia or other roads then constructed as may be necessary to complete a continuous line of coach road from a point at or below Yale to a point at the foot of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains and that the same shall be free of toll of any kind whatever.

Hon. MR. RING—I agree that some road tolls ought to be kept up.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—My only object is to bring this matter before the Executive. I cannot agree with the honorable member for Yale. I have not opposed any proposition of any man from personal motives.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—I oppose the motion of the honorable member for Lillooet. I think it does not meet the question.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—The objection to the whole matter in shape of a resolution is that by talking of road tolls we raise expectations we cannot probably fulfil. I had hoped honorable members would not press the subject. I assure the honorable gentleman that the petitions sent up have been the subject of earnest consideration. I attach weight to what the honorable member for Yale says in this House, and regret that such a feeling should go abroad.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—I, as member for Cariboo, should say something upon this matter. I have some doubt upon it. I would say this much as a member of the Government, that is, that many of their solutions brought up here and vetoed will probably form the subject of negotiations with the delegation in settling the terms. They will be a sort of substratum. I regard the taxing of those who use roads as the proper means for the keeping up the road, and furthermore, I fear to overload the terms.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—For such roads as were made on the petition of the people, tolls are justifiable, but tolls should not be kept up after the debt is defrayed. No doubt when this road comes under the rule of Canada she will construct turnpikes. Our road tolls are too high.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I regret the absence of the Hon. Chief Commissioner. I think that he has an impression that some such resolution as this is necessary. I regret that the matter was brought up to-day at all.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I proposed that the matter should be left open until Monday.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—Then let it be left open.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I have pointed out the Hon. Chief Commissioner's objections. He says that the road can be better kept up by the local than the Dominion Government. I regret the absence of the Hon. Chief Commissioner. He did not state to me any certain impression, but I am sure he would have been glad to have joined in the discussion. It has, I have no objection to state, been discussed in Executive Council, and this discussion will do good. I must oppose such resolution going up to the Governor, for it may create expectations which, when the terms go to the polls, cannot be fulfilled.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—I have no doubt when the terms come to the polls there will be one howl of discontent at the financial part of them from Cariboo to New Westminster. I wish to see roads toll free, but I do not wish to see the Dominion Government taking charge of our local interests, such as tolls. With regard to terms, I say that the financial terms will kill confederation when it comes to the polls. The people from Cariboo to New Westminster want these road tolls abolished.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—The Hon. Attorney General suggests, on behalf of the hon. Chief Commissioner, that we shall use the revenue; but this is a gain if we get free from

the maintenance of the roads. The Government should consider themselves part of the people, and endeavor to relax taxes. Another objection is, that under this arrangement roads would not be kept in repair so well as at present. I say, under Confederation, the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works would have control of roads. The Dominion Government is less likely to be penurious than a local Government. The hon. Chief Commissioner spoke to me after making that objection, and my distinct impression is that the hon. gentleman would support some such proposition as this. We ask what is in perfect harmony with reason. We may just as well ask Canada to do the whole thing and to maintain the whole road.

HON. MR. RING—It astonishes me that hon. gentlemen are connecting revenue with these tolls. It can only be justifiable to keep tolls for the repair of roads.

HON. DR. HELMCKEN—I am on the horns of a dilemma. If I vote for road tolls, being taxable, I shall be told I want to make the terms too heavy; if against them, I shall be told I am against confederation.

HON. MR. WALKEM—Sir: I have made few speeches during this debate, but this is a question on which I must ask leave to say a few words. Session after session the question has been brought down. We have had always a large Victoria element, and this question has, unfortunately, always taken a Victoria and Mainland issue. I have studied this matter carefully. With regard to the acts themselves they are very strong; they commence with preambles, as to construction, maintenance and repairs. The toll was not mentioned as to continue merely until the debt was extinguished, therefore I think the vote should be taken on another view. The benefits accrue equally to Victoria and the upper country; properly the farmer gets the lion's share; I know the upper country pretty well; formerly the miner used nothing outside of bacon and flour. This should not be made an Island and Mainland question.

HON. DR. HELMCKEN—I do not regard the subject as a joke. We have paid \$60,000 for roads on Vancouver Island—roads not one twentieth the length of those on the Mainland. Victoria gets more kicks than half-pence. Victoria pays the greater part of the tolls. I belong to a company who pay a large proportion. What do they propose in place of a road toll? Some one must pay it. Thirty thousand dollars per annum is required to keep roads in repair. I say Victoria and Vancouver Island are more concerned with what is for the good of the colony, generally, than any part of the Mainland.

HON. MR. HUMPHREYS—I rise to bear testimony to the fairness of the hon. members for Vancouver Island in whatever concerns the Mainland. I have always seen a desire on the part of Vancouver Island members to legislate for the whole, and not for a part of the colony. I am as tired of this bickering as a member of the Mainland. I consider it our duty to be more united. If

the hon. members for New Westminster and Yale would talk less about injustice to the Mainland it would be better. I regret the action of the hon. member of Yale, it is factious.

HON. MR. BARNARD—Vancouver Island has always made practical jokes of any questions from the Mainland.

HON. MR. DeCosmos rose to order.

HON. MR. BARNARD—I referred to the hon. gentleman for Victoria city. There are no road tolls on Vancouver Island. (Yes, a road tax!—hon. Dr. Helmcken.) As soon as the roads are paid for the people of the Mainland will, to a man, refuse to pay any more road tolls.

Every item has been used as a threat against confederation. I do not offer any such threat. I believe the upper country would accept confederation on the terms proposed. But if the Government expect that they will be able to collect this \$60,000 from the population of the upper country they are mistaken.

HON. MR. DeCosmos—The hon. member for Yale is unjust to Vancouver Islanders. The whole of this colony is paying large sums of money of interest on debt on roads.

HON. MR. BARNARD—I did not say what I did with reference to Vancouver Island members without consideration.

HON. MR. ROBSON—I hope that Government members, in view of the absence of the hon. Chief Commissioner, will vote so as to allow this resolution to go forward.

HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I must express a contrary hope.

The amendment of hon. Mr. Barnard was carried.

The Committee rose and reported the resolutions complete.

Council resumed and the resolutions passed in Committee were adopted except those with regard to the purchase of Alaska and the State of Maine.

Wednesday, 6th April, 1870.

The hon. Attorney General, in the absence of the hon. Colonial Secretary, Presiding Member.

On motion, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, to take into consideration the message of His Excellency the Governor respecting the provision to be made for the sending of Delegates to Ottawa.

HON. MR. Ball in the Chair.

HON. COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—Sir, I rise to move,

That suitable provision be made by this House for the payment of the expenses of the Delegates to be sent from this colony to Ottawa to negotiate the terms of the confederation of this colony with the Dominion of Canada.

This has been one of the preliminary steps taken by the other colonies before going into confederation. If it has been necessary in

other cases, it is certainly necessary for us. The expense is comparatively small, probably from \$2500 to \$5000, and the Governor has preferred to bring the matter before the Council now, instead of putting it into a supplementary estimate next season.

Hon. MR. RING—Sir, I beg to inquire why these resolutions cannot be transmitted by post. I do not see why the colony should be put to the expense of conveying the message; there is postal communication with Canada, and sufficient means of conveying to the Canadian Government what we have agreed upon. There can be no necessity to send hon. members to Ottawa. The fact of our doing so would lead to the presumption that confederation is agreed upon. I differ in that. I say the people want to have the terms before them. Let us first see whether the colony assents to confederation in the abstract. Why should we send three or four hon. and learned gentlemen—learned, no doubt. Why, I say, should we have the colony put to so much expense when it is in a state of poverty and bankruptcy. (No, no.) I say, dispatch the terms in the ordinary way by post.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I hope, sir, it will not be necessary to fight our battles over again. This House has, in the name of the colony—(No, no, from hons. Ring and Drake.) Perhaps it will suit some hon. members better to say a majority of this House. (No, no.) Perhaps certain hon. members will have the decency to be quiet until their turn comes to speak. A majority of this House, an overwhelming majority, has decided upon terms. We shall get the consent of the Canadian Government to these or modified conditions, and then submit them to the people. That is the only way. If we were, as proposed by the hon. member for Nanaimo, to ask the people whether they wanted confederation, what would they say? (Mr. Ring—They would say 'No!'). They would say most emphatically, yes, on terms. They have said so for years. The Governor has adopted the usual course. These resolutions will go to the Canadian Government and come back, perhaps modified, and the people will then be asked if they will have confederation on these terms. The terms are now proposed to be sent to Ottawa. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Nanaimo that it would be cheaper to send them by post. The first outlay might be smaller, but it might cause delay, and in my opinion, British Columbia cannot afford delay. The telegraph might do, but it would cost more. It ought to be by delegation. I think the House is entitled to know who are to go. I presume the Government will be prepared to give us the names. I, for one, would be unprepared to vote a sum of \$2500, or more likely \$5000, if I thought the Governor would send Delegates who would not be acceptable to the people. I say that the people ought to be represented, and that particular members who will fairly represent the people on the responsible government question ought to go. I say that if the Dele-

gates are silent on responsible government, the Cabinet at Ottawa will raise it. If the Delegates say that British Columbia is not prepared for it, that it has been voted down, the Cabinet will say, because they have reason to believe that the people, or a large proportion of them, want it, and that they have had enough of discontent. I say that, although responsible government is not, strictly speaking, a condition it underlies and permeates the whole question.

Hon. COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—Nothing would be easier than to forward the resolutions by post to Canada. This has probably been done already; but on every one of the resolutions, as you all know, there are numerous points requiring explanations, and to make these effective the presence at Ottawa of Delegates on our part, understanding the question and authorised to act for us, would appear to be indispensable. I am inclined to think that the names of the Delegates are pretty well known, but I have no authority to mention them here. The governor has chosen them on his own responsibility, and he does not ask the Council to share that responsibility. For what purpose should the names be given? Does the Council wish to canvass the merits of each individual? What those gentlemen will say on the subject of responsible government I am not prepared to tell you, but I tell you this, that on that subject and on every other they will act with fairness and ability, with no discredit to themselves and with no discredit to us. I am ready at any rate to trust them so far as that. I hope this Council will trust them as the Governor has shown himself ready to trust them. Every year there are expenses that cannot be provided for except in the supplementary Estimates. This will doubtless be one of them. There will be no objectionable special tax, that I know of, proposed on this account. If there is, it will be time enough to oppose it when it comes. In the meantime you are asked simply to authorise the expenditure of a small sum of money for an object of infinite importance.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—There is a mighty curious dust kicked up by great opposites when they meet. I think we shall see some of these gentlemen hoisted on their own petards. I have a pretty good idea who the gentlemen are, and I do not think they represent the people, especially in the matter of responsible government. I believe the Governor will act fairly and honorably, but I think he will not select men who will be acceptable to the people. My opinion is that the hon. Chief Commissioner, the hon. member for Victoria and the hon. Attorney General do not represent the people. Popular members will be untrue to themselves.

Hon. MR. DEWDNEY—The hon. member has had his guess. I do not desire to mention names. I would merely suggest that His Excellency be requested to select one of the Delegates from the Mainland.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—My views on responsible government have been so often

expressed that there is no occasion to refer to them again, but I am astonished that after hon. members have told us that the people are a unit in favor of responsible government, they should be afraid to trust it to the people, or to the Council, which His Excellency has told you he will form after this Session. Why, then, are hon. members so desirous to weight down the terms? Are they afraid that the people will not be so unanimous at the polls in favor of responsible government? His Excellency has told you that, if allowed by Her Majesty's Government, he proposes to form a Council which will be representative. I, for one have no doubt about the permission. The question will then be left to that Council. Why are hon. members afraid to leave this question to the representatives of the people?

HON. MR. HUMPHREYS—I will answer the hon. Chief Commissioner; we are not afraid of putting the question before the people, but I am afraid that members of that delegation will misrepresent the opinions of the people to the Canadian Government; I fear the people will not be represented.

HON. MR. DRAKE—Mr. Chairman, I intend to oppose the resolution proposed by the hon. Collector of Customs. I think that if hon. members examine this message, in connection with His Excellency's speech, it is apparent that the resolution was sent down complete. This House was not allowed to alter them. The recommendations of hon. members were voted down. I think it would be better to send the resolutions by post as the resolutions of government; they are not the resolutions of this committee.

HON. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—They are the resolutions of this House.

HON. MR. DRAKE—No; only of the official majority. The expense is unnecessary; it is one which will be incurred to enforce the views of government. His Excellency asks that he should be authorized to expend a sum of money for this special purpose. A special tax is asked for. If we accede to this message we are assuming the responsibility. I would like to ask this question: Is the Delegation to take powers from this House or from the government?

HON. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I must reply without delay to one proposition. I would like the hon. gentleman to point out any one example or suggestion which, if defeated, was not defeated by a majority of, so called, popular members, with the exception of responsible government, in which there was a majority of, so-called, representative members. The hon. gentleman's remarks fall to the ground.

HON. MR. HUMPHREYS—The mistake has been made at that end of the table. I think we are in duty bound to send delegates and raise the money. My only objection is that the names are withheld. I cannot understand why hon. members should vote against this message. I believe we are all agreed that delegates should go, but if names are not sent down, I must vote against it.

HON. MR. DECOSMOS—Mr. Chairman, I scarcely expected a discussion upon this point; I should have supposed that this House would have voted the money at once. The question is whether this Delegation will be representative or not. I do not intend to offer any factious opposition. I am satisfied that the people will take means to send a people's delegation.

HON. MR. BARNARD—Current report names the gentlemen. The object of sending by delegates is that the terms may be modified, if necessary. If unsatisfactory, will not the people have a right to say, "How could we expect anything better." Here are two members, recent converts, and one a decided opponent. How can a popular member go to his constituents after voting this money. The people are in earnest in this matter. I stand on the floor of this House a government contractor, and likely to support the government; but so long as I give a straight vote on Confederation my constituents cared not about anything else. On the Mainland we have been firm on Confederation all through, and the Mainland is ignored. The two hon. gentlemen at the head of this table represent the Island, and the two other hon. members represent the Island. The Mainland is not going to be satisfied, particularly when the hon. senior member for Victoria, who has consistently opposed and will oppose Confederation, is to be one of the delegation. For the first time in twenty years the hon. gentleman leaves this Island; he knows nothing about the interior of the country.

HON. MR. DRAKE—The hon. Chief Commissioner stated that the whole of the recommendations were carried, except one, by the majority of the popular vote. I instance free port and the telegraph to the contrary.

HON. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I must explain that I spoke from recollection. I was not in the House.

HON. MR. ROBSON—I claim that the official members who voted against responsible government must be struck out. But if we allow them to be counted, there is still a majority of six to three of the representative members in favor of responsible government; and I say that this resolution ought to be transmitted with such explanation as is necessary. With regard to responsible government being in the hands of the new Council, members will, we may presume, be elected for four years; consequently the question will, in all probability, be postponed for four years. And I say that those who keep back responsible government will run a great risk of having Confederation defeated at the polls. Some hon. members may desire such a result. If so I can understand the course they are taking. With regard to the individuals going on the Delegation, if we are to take the general rumor there is not one who will properly represent the Mainland. There are two recent converts, and one open opponent of Confederation, an implacable and politically unprincipled enemy to Confederation, leagued with

some power, I won't say with the cloven footed gentleman, but with some power to defeat Confederation. The people will not be satisfied. It is extraordinary that the Governor should make such a selection, ignoring the whole Confederation party and the whole Mainland as a territory. I could not justify myself if I voted for this resolution, which will virtually be voting for three Island members, two recent converts and one—(No, no! from Dr. Helmcken)—well, I won't say it again. (Laughter.) I can understand a Government dishonest at heart pursuing this course, but I cannot understand a Government that is true to the cause doing so.

HON. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Mr. Chairman, hon. members seem to be in position of fighting shadows in the dark. If they are wrong in their suppositions all the words that have been spoken to-day are thrown away. I fully concur in what fell from the hon. member for Victoria city to the Executive Council. I believe his Excellency to be a confederate at heart. I will, in order to simplify matters, move to report progress, and ask leave to sit again, so that the Governor may have the opportunity of sending down names, or at all events, of satisfying the Mainland that their interests, and responsible government are cared for.

The motion to rise and report progress was lost.

HON. MR. RING—I think this debate, if it may be so called, is quite uncalled for and unnecessary. It is ridiculous to bring up the names of men who may possibly go to Ottawa and discuss them; it ought not to be allowed. It is waste of time and lungs. I had prepared a resolution that the terms should be sent by post, but I see that it would be vain to put it to the vote. If delegates go they ought to be properly equipped. I shall not, therefore, oppose the vote.

HON. MR. DEWDNEY—I agree with the hon. member for Nanaimo that this debate is waste of time. I think the Mainland will be represented.

HON. MR. DECOSMOS—I think it is not a question whether Island or Mainland is represented. We want the views of different parties represented, leaving out the Mainland and Island.

HON. MR. ROBSON—I express a hope that the Government will not press a Government vote.

HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I can inform hon. members that I feel perfectly satisfied that the Governor will not send down names. The hon. member who names the delegates has better information than myself, the House having given unanimous adhesion to the terms, (No, no, I was the exception,—hon. Mr. DeCosmos.) at all events it was passed by a majority, and so becomes the act of the council. We could not expect Canada to send delegates here; they would be unable to refer to the Executive Council. It must injure the terms if in the debates of this House an expression of opinion goes forth to the world that the Governor has not Confederation truly at heart. The hon. member for New Westminster says that I am a convert, and that I represent Victoria. I am glad that the old idea that I leaned too much to New Westminster, is exploded. I should be sorry that it should run in the other direction. The hon. member for New Westminster has told us we cannot get responsible government, but he would not consent to make it a *SINE QUA NON*.

HON. MR. ROBSON—I have never said that Confederation would be refused without responsible government.

HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I have no doubt, I am not speaking from positive knowledge, but I have no doubt that the delegates will be clothed with full power to discuss all the suggestions made on this matter; if responsible government is started by the Canadian Cabinet it will receive full consideration.

HON. HUMPHREYS—The people do not distrust His Excellency, but they do think that if certain members of the government are sent on this delegation they will endeavour to keep up the present system. I am satisfied that if the hon. members named are sent Confederation is killed.

HON. CHIEF COMMISSIONER said those who support Confederation are injuring the cause. I believe sir, that if a consistent supporter of confederation from the Island, and one from British Columbia are sent as this delegation, with one member of the Government, such a delegation would carry confidence even if the terms were modified. I propose to vote for this resolution. I hope the Delegates will be such as will give satisfaction. I contend that there are officials who would add weight to that delegation, and I should not like to see official members left out.

On division the resolution was carried, only one vote being against it.

On motion of the Hon. Chief Commissioner, Committee rose and reported resolution passed.

House adopted resolution.

Reported for the Government by

W. S. SEBRIGHT GREEN.