

# BRITISH COLONIST--SUPPLEMENT.

VOL. 5.

VICTORIA. VANCOUVER ISLAND. TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 1864.

NO. 32.

## ENGLISH AFFAIRS.

The arrival of Garibaldi in London seems to have produced an electrical effect that has not yet subsided. This simple, brave, and patriotic man, who has borne more than his share of vicissitudes of life—who has been the working, industrious, and adventurous of California as well as the hero of the liberation of Italy—who has, in the face of that lofty pity that has been pronounced impossibilities—gave to his country freedom and conferred territory and wealth on a hitherto insignificant kingdom—made monarchs his debtors, and, with the proud pride of Cincinnatus or Washington, refused to receive himself the legitimate reward of his glorious deeds—this unassuming individual carries, without the aid of a single adherent, the British metropolis by storm. Half a million people come out to welcome him in the streets, and a more densely thronged multitude, even than that which crushed each other to death on the arrival of the Princess Alexandra, assemble to do him honor. No wonder that such an ovation should have been intensely disagreeable to the more despotic crowned heads of continental Europe. To see the determined and successful enemy of "right Divine" tyrants, the cynosure of millions admiring eyes in the world's metropolis—to hear him receive the deafening plaudits of a sympathizing and powerful people—to read of his being led by Princes, Dukes, and ministers—was surely enough to terrify the brave Austrian monarchs, who have been recently congratulating themselves on the bloody victory over 80 women and children at the "Soderberg bombardment." Even Louis Napoleon, it is said, was not well pleased at the overwhelming demonstration, and so we had the machinery of diplomacy—the wires and puppets—set in motion, and the Italian liberator got a courteous notice to quit, which he was just on the threshold of his English welcome. Amongst the highly conservative English aristocracy also, there were some misgivings as to the advisability of allowing the minds of the provincial masses to be operated upon by this powerful magnet, who was neither a representative of royalty nor a scion of nobility, but rather antagonistic to both. What was more, however, he was a successful revolutionist—not like Mazzini, whose patriotic efforts were always under a cloud. There might have been, therefore, something impolitic in allowing this potent influence to come in contact with men who have been heretofore more accustomed to worship rank than sentiment—show that principle. In Garibaldi they might have seen the ideal of Hugo's "representative of progress"—something beyond mere outward glitter and ostentatious show—the embodiment of a principle that seeks for the elevation not the subordination of mankind. The governing classes of England, however much in favor of Italian independence, are not remarkable for extending the political privileges of the governed of their own country. They admire foreign revolution, and will accordingly afford it valuable sustenance, as they will present the caged bear in the Zoological Gardens with a loaf of bread, but they have to love for the animal, and desire to depit it at a respectful distance. Of course revolution is a thing no one expects to see in England, but there are agitations and deep grumblings ready at any moment to force their way to the surface—and a lucky and admitted gambler is not the best example to set before those who are "scent of cash."

Another attempt has been made to enlarge the area of the Counties Franchise. Mr. Locke King introduced into the House of Commons a bill for extending the Franchise of county voters to £10 occupants. The qualification is at present £50. After a lengthy discussion on the second reading the bill was thrown out—the "previous question" having been moved, and carried by a vote of 254 against 227, giving a majority of 27. The same cries that have always met an attempted extension of the franchise were not wanting on this occasion. There was that dreaded "democracy"—that "great unwashed"—ready to read and devour the British Constitution so soon as it was admitted to a voice in the country's legislation. The whole of the opposition, however, was not hackneyed. Lord Montagu, a Conservative, with considerable originality, and a very small amount of sense, went out of the beaten track and stated some startling truths, from which he made almost equally startling deductions. He said that Parliamentary representation was at present a sham, and that any attempt to improve it would make it a greater sham. The county franchise, he said, was nothing but a machinery for returning anybody the local peers chose to nominate. The borough franchise was only a machinery for choosing any rich man whom the respective "whips" of the party, chancing to be

predominant in the borough, chose to nominate. Therefore, this distinguished logician argued that, as the whole thing was rotten, the subject should not be approached.

An interesting debate took place in the House of Lords on Monday, June 11, on the Danish question. The speech of Lord Grey was the best that has yet been delivered on the subject. He said, according to the *Speaker*, "that had we openly warned the Germans that if they attempted to cross the Eider they would find the frontier defended by English troops, peace as well as justice would have been promoted. Austria dare not venture needlessly on a war with the distant North, which would have brought a British fleet into the Adriatic and raised Venice and Hungary and Prussia could not have fought alone. Further, we had menaced without performance. The British Minister at Berlin transmitted home a paper drawn up by the Prussian Government, and in that document it was distinctly asserted that England used threats to prevent measures being adopted by Prussia, and that those threats had been vain." Lord Russell's reply," says the *Speaker*, "was very weak. He said we could not have defended the Eider, because the Baltic was not open, till Lord Derby reminded him that the mouth of the Eider was not in the Baltic but in the North Sea. He said England ought not to risk a war alone, or alone with Sweden and Denmark, and that France would not join her. But his oddest argument against war was that Mr. Gladstone had shown so great a prosperity and so large a surplus that it would be a pity to diminish it. On what state of the National Exchequer would Lord Russell then ground a special argument for war?"

Another member of Lord Palmerston's Government has been obliged to resign—Mr. Robert Lowe, Minister of Education; a vote of censure having passed the House of 101 to 93 against Mr. Lowe's mutilation of the reports of the Inspectors of Schools. There is considerable comment amongst the London press on the difficulty of obtaining young or at least middle-aged competent men to accept positions in the Cabinet. Mr. Stansfield's appointment, junior Lord of the Admiralty, was offered to Mr. Baxter, member for Montrose, who is a practical man of business, with a Scotch accent that makes the House wince every time he rises to speak. Mr. Baxter valued his business occupation more than official position, and refuses, and the post is then offered to and accepted by Mr. Childers, formerly a member of the House of Assembly at Melbourne, and at present agent for the Colony of Victoria, and member of Parliament for Pontefract.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, January 15, 1864.  
House met at half-past 3 o'clock. Members present—Messrs. Trimble, Franklin, Powell, Duncan, Dennes and DeCosmos.

**THE MINUTES.**  
The remarks of Dr. Trimble in reference to the section of the Crown Lands report to the effect that all sections after sec. 20 were struck out in consequence of their being unconnected with the evidence, appearing in the minutes, were cancelled by order of the House.

**AMENDMENTS.**  
The amendments on the Half-of-one per Cent. Tax, and the Harbor Improvements, were finally passed.

**CROWN LANDS REPORT.**  
Dr. Trimble presented the report of the committee once more, and moved for its adoption, seconded by Dr. Powell.

Mr. DeCosmos moved that it be considered in committee of the whole to-morrow (Thursday).  
The Speaker said that the necessary motion was first to lay the report on the table.

Dr. Trimble and Powell then altered their motion to this form.  
Mr. Duncan gave notice that he would move to-morrow (Thursday) that His Excellency be respectfully requested to appoint a commission with adequate powers to inquire into all matters in connection with the Crown Lands.

The Speaker said the motion should come on when the report was up for consideration in the Committee of the whole.  
After some discussion as to the competency of the House to go into Committee of the whole on the question, it was ultimately decided that to-morrow (Thursday) the report would come up in the Committee of the House when Mr. Duncan's motion would be in order. The Speaker stating that the usual way was to propose a resolution to cause the report to be taken into consideration.  
The House then adjourned.

**THURSDAY, June 16, 1864.**  
House met at 3:15, P.M. Members present—Messrs. DeCosmos, Powell, Franklin, Trimble, Tolmie, Dances, Street, Cairns, and Dennes.

**IMPERIAL DESPATCHES.**  
The Speaker read a communication from His Excellency the Governor, enclosing despatches from the Duke of Newcastle in reference to lot "Z" in the James Bay Reserve, so long a subject of dispute between the Crown and the Hudson Bay Company. The Duke of Newcastle, in the name of the Crown, was surrendered to the Crown by the Company in terms of the compromise be-

tween them, but the Company had previously sold it to Lowenberg, who, writing from Hamburg to the Hudson Bay Company in London, makes claim to the lot. The Duke of Newcastle, although admitting that "Sir James Douglas had described Lowenberg as merely the agent or instrument of the company in the sale and purchase of this land, does not consider that such a statement without further evidence would justify the Governor in restoring his claim," and therefore authorizes Governor Kennedy to give Lowenberg a valid title.

The despatches were laid on the table.

**CROWN LANDS.**  
The House went into committee on the Crown Lands report; Dr. Powell in the chair.

Mr. DeCosmos said he had only one object in moving the consideration of this report. The report was divided into two heads—one, whether the House would or would not accept the proposition of the Duke of Newcastle as to the Civil List, and take the Crown Lands; the other was in regard to the Crown Land and the Hudson Bay Company. One section of the report before the House stated that an immense sum, making with lands over \$1,000,000, belonging to the colony was in the hands of the Company, and they should be forced to make restitution. This was a matter in which no half and half measures should be taken. He held in his hand a draft of an address to His Excellency, the Governor in reference to the matter, which, although rather longer than he would wish, was perhaps called for, as when a former petition had been sent to the Home Government under the Earl of Derby, they had asked for facts and figures. The hon. gentleman here read the following address:

To His Excellency Arthur Edward Kennedy, C. B., Governor of Vancouver Island, &c. &c.

May it Please Your Excellency,  
We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Assembly of Vancouver Island, in this present session convened, have had under consideration the Crown Lands of the Colony with the object of determining the advisability of accepting the control of them in regard to voting a Civil List mentioned in the despatch of His Grace the Duke of Newcastle of June, 1863.

During our investigations we have learned the following facts and have formed the following opinions:

1. That the Hudson Bay Company of England became possessors of the Crown Lands of this Colony, without any exception, by virtue of and under the conditions contained in a Royal Grant made on January 13th, 1849; and as Trustees of the Crown, they were bound by the Grant to sell the Crown Lands for colonization purposes; and that the gross proceeds of the sales, after deducting therefrom one-tenth for the special benefit and use of the Company, were to be devoted to the colonization and settlement of the Island.

2. That the Hudson Bay Company have sold a part of the Crown Lands to divers persons for the purpose of colonization and settlement; that a part of the Crown Lands has been set apart as reserves for public purposes; and that the title to the remaining portion of the Crown Lands is still vested in the Company in conformity with the conditions of the grant of January 13th, 1849.

3. That the Hudson Bay Company are willing to convey back the unused remainder of the Crown Lands, including certain reserves for public purposes to the Crown in accordance with the conditions of an Indenture made in London on February 3rd, 1862, between Her Majesty and the Hudson Bay Company.

4. That during the investigations of this House into the condition of the Crown Lands it has been learned that the Hudson Bay Company have sold portions of sections 18 and 32, and hold section 31 (all of Victoria District), with portions of said sections 18 and 32 as their private property; that the approximate sum of money received for sales in sections 18 and 32 is \$426,237, and that the approximate value of the property still held by the Company as their private property in sections 18, 31 and 32, is \$339,200, making the total amount of the sales and the value of the property in the sections still in possession of the Company, \$765,437; and it appears that not one farthing has been paid by the Company for the said sections 18, 31 and 32; that the Company have not accounted to the Colonial Trust Fund for the said \$426,237, and that by the conditions of the Royal Grant of January 13, 1849, the Company were bound to account to Her Majesty for the property known as sections 18, 31 and 32 aforesaid and the sale thereof, in the same manner as for other portions of the Crown Lands.

5. That by virtue of the said Indenture of February 3rd, 1862, it is proposed to allow the Hudson Bay Company to remain in undisturbed possession of the said \$426,237 in sales, and the said \$339,200 in property; and further, that it is proposed in the said Indenture to convey away all the water-frontage in Victoria Harbor and Cadboro Bay, fronting on land sold or held by the Company, abutting on the water of Victoria Harbor and Cadboro Bay; and that the said water frontage may be stated on an approximate estimate to be worth \$500,000.

6. That if the said Indenture of February 3rd, 1862, be not annulled the Crown will lose the vast sum of \$1,265,437 or thereabouts in money and property, less one tenth of the said \$426,237.

7. That if the said Indenture of February 3rd, 1862 be annulled and a settlement made between the Crown and the Hudson Bay Company on the conditions of the Royal Grant of January 13, 1849, that is to say, by crediting the Company with the value of their establishments in the colony on the expiry of the Royal License of Exclusive Trade with the Indians on the North West Coast of America which terminated on May 30, 1859,

and also by crediting the Company with the advances made by them for colonizing the Island, there would in all probability be a balance which the Company would be bound to account for to the Crown of about \$1,000,000 in money and property.

8. That in the opinion of this House there is no good and sufficient reason to justify a settlement between the Crown and the Hudson Bay Company on the conditions set forth in said Indenture of February 3, 1862.

9. That in the opinion of this House the said Indenture of February 3, 1862, ought to be annulled, and a settlement made between the Crown and Hudson Bay Company in conformity with the conditions of the Royal Grant of January 13, 1849.

10. That in the opinion of this House, if a final settlement be made between the Crown and the Hudson Bay Company on the conditions set forth in the said Indenture of February 3rd, 1862, not only will there be a serious injury done to the finances of this colony, but the settlement would materially prejudice His Grace the Duke of Newcastle; but that Her Majesty's Government will sustain a serious loss in the sums already paid out of the Imperial treasury to the Company for the colonization of this Island, which in the opinion of this House would be restored if a settlement were made between the Crown and the Hudson Bay Company on the conditions of the Grant of January 13, 1849.

11. That, in the opinion of this House, your Excellency ought to impress on Her Majesty's Government the necessity that exists for annulling the said Indenture of Feb. 3, 1862, in order to make a settlement between the Crown and the Company in conformity with the conditions of the Royal Grant of January 13, 1849; and furthermore that your Excellency ought to call on the Crown to appoint a Commission empowered to administer oaths and send for persons and papers to enquire into the sums of money expended specially and essentially by the Company for colonizing this Island in accordance with the Royal Grant of 1849; and furthermore to enquire whether any sales of land in the said sections 18, 31 and 32, have been made by the Company since January 1862; and furthermore to determine what lands of this Colony, and the value thereof, have been lawfully sold by the Company; and to learn the amount of money deducted from the gross proceeds of such sales by the Company, and the amount paid to them in the Royal Grant of 1849.

12. That, in the opinion of this House, no attempt should be made to disturb third parties in the possession of lands derived from the Hudson Bay Company, except such lands be part of existing Public Reserves, lawfully made in accordance with the Royal Grant of 1849; and even in the latter case, no attempt should be made to disturb third parties in the possession of such lands except great public inconvenience would probably arise therefrom; and in case the Hudson Bay Company have sold illegally, or indemnify the Crown to the value thereof.

13. That, in the opinion of this House, your Excellency ought to take all and every such measures, either by sending an agent to England to lay the condition of the Crown Lands before Her Majesty's Government or the Imperial Parliament, or both, or by employing able counsel in England to take proceedings to annul the said Indenture of February 3rd, 1862, and bring about a speedy settlement between the Crown and Hudson Bay Company on the conditions of the Royal Grant of 1849.

14. That, in the opinion of this House, your Excellency should take such measures as may forever prevent the Church Reserve in the City of Victoria from being let out in parcels, or covered with private residences or business places of any kind; in order that it may be forever preserved as a public square.

We, the House of Assembly of Vancouver Island, would therefore humbly pray that your Excellency may be pleased to take the facts and opinions hereinbefore set forth into your earnest consideration, and appoint such a commission, and for such purposes as are thereinbefore stated; and that your Excellency may be pleased to take such other measures as are hereinbefore mentioned, and any other means that may from time to time appear expedient to your Excellency to annul the said Indenture of February 3rd, 1862, and bring about a final settlement between the Crown and Hudson Bay Company on the basis of the conditions of the Royal Grant of January 13th, 1849; and secure a speedy re-conveyance of the Island by the Company to the Crown.

And, as in duty bound, we will ever pray, &c. &c.

House of Assembly,  
June 16, 1864.

Dr. Helmecken would say a few words on this question. He was not about to make any apologies for the Hudson Bay Company; they had right and justice on their side. They were certainly quite as honest as any hon. gentleman in this House, and much more so than some of them. He thought the question raised by the Crown Lands Committee was useless, as the matter had been settled long ago. He took it that the report was totally informal and ought never to have been sent to the House. As it had come down, however, he would not place anything in its way. He did not complain of the committee, but if the House permitted committees to travel out of their province in this manner, it would lead to endless trouble hereafter. As to the question as to the possibility of annulling the agreement of 1849, the first Legislative Assembly of this colony stated that the House had no control over funds not raised by themselves, and refused to be responsible for any debts incurred by the Hudson Bay Company or the Executive for this colony. Up to the dissolution of the first House this policy was kept in view. In the agreement between the Hudson Bay Company and the Home Government it is expressly stated that the Hudson Bay Com-

pany were to find funds to carry on the settlement of the colony, and if the Home Government ever took the Island this should be paid back to the Company. The conduct of the House in refusing to be responsible for any expenditure, was in order to throw the expenses on the Home Government. At the next general election the Hudson Bay Company affairs were the theme of every candidate, and many of the candidates said that these matters were entirely between the Home Government and the Company, with which this Legislature had nothing to do; and two of these gentlemen holding this view were elected in opposition to the one gentleman holding opposite views, who now introduced this address (Mr. DeCosmos). The second House had fully confirmed the action of the former House, judging that if they interfered they would render the colony responsible for the expenses of Government. He (Dr. Helmecken) was still of opinion that the agreement was made between the Hudson Bay Company and the Home Government, and should be settled entirely by them. And he believed that the Home Government had finally settled the matter. They never imagined the colony had anything to do with the matter, as for six years previously we had refused to be responsible. The first step the Home Government took was to refuse to take the Hudson Bay Company's establishment and pay them therefor. It was stated in the agreement of 1849 that the Home Government was to take over the establishments, and in doing so, they gave over to the Company the town site, the lot, the farms, the coal mines, the Fort Rupert and all the Hudson Bay Company property. The hon. gentleman went back to the first settlement of the land by the Hudson Bay Company, stating that the claim of the Company to the land was responsible. The report of the Committee of the Company to the Island was conferred through the license to trade on the North-west coast; this was denied entirely, the Company simply took the land and held it like any other people. In 1849 the Island was granted to the Hudson Bay Company under certain conditions, one of which was as he had already stated that the Government should repay the Company for their establishments. He would remark here that the Company had done the country a great deal of good in importing good stock, and in retaining the country for foreigners. He did not take the question in a legal point of view; he was not competent, nor was any gentleman on the Committee. No one here had either the ability or the right to take up the question in this light. This should be looked on as a question of right between man and man, he would tell them what he saw when he came to this colony in 1850. He found the Hudson Bay Company's Fort with a few cabins of the Company's servants. The hon. gentleman described the boundaries of the Company's farms at that time, and how they were cultivated, and said what was now named the town site was in 1850 the cultivated fields of the Hudson Bay Company. He would ask whether the Company should be deprived of their cultivated possessions? He would also say that where Mr. Cridge's house was now, there was a large piggery, and where Bishop Denner's house is now was a large dairy, and he would ask whether the Hudson Bay Company was not entitled to every foot of these lands on which they had expended so much money. But now because they had become so valuable they were looked after, and thus the Company's title had been strengthened. It was only a question of \$700,000, and not of right! (Dr. Tolmie—hear, hear.) The said deeds of the plots of land claimed by the Hudson Bay branch of the Hudson Bay Company were surveyed, and the claims were recorded in the Land Office by the Company; they could have had the land by paying £1 an acre for it, and although for certain reasons they did not, the land was legally and properly theirs as between man and man. No one ever supposed that Victoria would become valuable; Esquimaux was expected to be the city of Vancouver Island, and had been reserved for that purpose. He would not go into the question of land, but he would ask if hon. gentlemen would wish to take advantage of a law in the title if that existed, to take possession of land that was not their own? He did not take a legal view of the matter, but for his legal opinion on this question was not worth anything, and he did not think the legal opinion of any hon. member in the House was any better. (laughter.) Her Majesty's Government had granted land round every one of the Hudson Bay Company's forts in British Columbia, and would in similar manner have granted the lands round Fort Victoria. The hon. member had alluded to San Juan, but he would say that when the San Juan dispute was settled, every man would get all the property he now holds, and the Hudson Bay Company would also get every bit of property they now held! (Dr. Tolmie—hear, hear.) The House of Assembly had refused to have anything to do with the settlement of the question, in that they had repudiated any responsibility, and the Indenture, which according to the report, was virtually a final settlement of the question was final. (Mr. DeCosmos, No, no.) The address moved by the hon. member for Victoria said no evidence had been obtained to show that the Hudson Bay Company had been guilty of fraud, and because the committee could find out no fraud, they said that the evidence was unsatisfactory. He would again repeat that the company was as honest as any member of this House, and much more so than some. Hon. members of the committee had expressed their dissatisfaction that the agreement had been referred to arbitration, but he (Dr. Helmecken) was not so fond of litigation as to have the matter so decided. If the matter had gone to law, the company would have held on to the Island till they were paid for their establishments, which they valued at a million and a quarter of dollars, a sum which would swamp the whole \$600,000, which the report claimed. His own opinion was that the Hudson Bay Com-