

the local Government, and to the Canadian Pacific Railway, on the same terms. I will not take up the time of the House longer than to say that I am very glad, after listening to hon. gentlemen, to find that the measure so commends itself to the approval and judgment of the House as to elicit no more severe or serious criticisms than have been expressed.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman, in supposing that I referred to the plan of Mr. Huntington as being to carry this traffic down to San Francisco and to New York. It is a much more dangerous one than that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the plan?

Mr. BLAKE. It takes a much more southern port than New York.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the Minister if this clause means the cost at which they sell coal in San Francisco, with the transportation added, or less the transportation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The cost at the mine.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I wish to make a few remarks upon this subject more particularly in reference to the expressions which fell from the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Homer). He says the Graving Dock is in a very insecure place. I would remind him of the fact that the Graving Dock is right in the rear of Her Majesty's dock-yard. In clause 12 of the Terms of Union, it is provided that:—

"The Dominion Government shall guarantee the interest for ten years from the date of the completion of the works at the rate of 5 per centum per annum, on such sum not exceeding £100,000 sterling, as may be required for the construction of a first-class Graving Dock at Esquimalt."

Now, that being in the Terms of Union, I apprehend that it is not within the power of this Parliament to remove the Graving Dock, however much the hon. member for New Westminster might desire it—and I equally apprehend that he is speaking rather from a sectional than a Dominion point of view in this matter—that he could not induce this Dominion Parliament to remove the Esquimalt Graving Dock to Burrard Inlet without its previously receiving the approbation of the people, and having been sanctioned by the Government of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman also quoted from General Laurie's report. I have also General Laurie's report here, and I would only say, as far as that report goes, that it is simply an individual opinion. I have the very highest respect for General Laurie and for his opinion, but, at the same time, the very best men in this world are liable to err, and I think he has erred in his opinion on that particular point. But, whether he has erred or not, the fact remains the same, that the Esquimalt Graving Dock has been commenced at Esquimalt, in keeping with the Terms of Union, and the construction will be continued by the Dominion Government (to which Government it has now been transferred) until it is brought to a successful completion. As regards the railway lands that are given to this Company, that is a matter, like many other matters that are embodied in this Bill, which has gone before our Local Legislature, and which is composed of twenty-five members; out of those twenty-five members, fifteen voted for the Bill and seven against it. I was present on this occasion and saw the vote taken. There were two gentlemen who did not vote, and very rightly, too. One was Mr. Dunsmuir himself, who thought possibly it would not be the correct thing to vote in a matter in which he had either a direct or an indirect interest, although it was in connection with the Dominion Government, more particularly than with the Local. The other gentleman was the member for Cassiar, who held, to a slight extent, different views upon the measure as a whole, and for these slight differences of opinion he also abstained from voting. The twenty-fifth member was, like your honourable self, the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Speaker in the Chair. Now, fifteen out of twenty-two having carried this measure in British Columbia, and in my constituency six out of the eight members having voted in favour of the measure, and three out of the four members for the city of Victoria having voted for it, I think, Mr. Speaker, it leaves me very little option in the matter, even supposing I held views diametrically opposed to the members in the Local Legislature. I am sent here, not to speak my views individually, not to vote from my own individual standpoint, but to vote in keeping with, and to express the opinions of the people who sent me here. These people have evinced to the whole of this Parliament exactly what their opinion is upon this particular matter; and, as has already been stated, nine-tenths, certainly in the city of Victoria and its surroundings—and that is the district I represent—are in favour of this measure. The majority of British Columbians are also in favour of this settlement, as has been shown by the vote taken in the House which has been already referred to, and I think, if I felt ever so much disposed to vote against the Bill, it would be my bounden duty, considering that those people who have already given their opinion in the Local Legislature, represent collectively the same number of inhabitants of a Province which we six here represent, at all hazards to vote for the measure brought in by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. I think the principal matter that we have to consider, as a Dominion House of Commons, is whether we are making a good bargain with British Columbia or not. The matter has already been maturely considered over there, and the arguments of the hon. member for New Westminster, as also those of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon), go to show that unquestionably the Dominion Government has (as it usually does) made a good bargain with British Columbia. The 3,500,000 acres of land in the Peace River country are of themselves sufficient compensation to the Dominion Government for the small amount of \$750,000 embodied in this Bill. In fact, the value of that land is more than that. I have every reason to know that the value of those lands in the Peace River country is at least \$1 an acre. I am also in a position to know that there are people at this moment who are willing to make an offer to the Government, in any case, of 50 cents an acre to purchase these lands upon five years' time, paying 10 cents in the first year, 10 cents in the second year, 10 cents in the third year, 10 cents in the fourth year, and so on until the whole amount is paid, upon a colonization scheme; that they will undertake to take lands in alternate sections and further to put so many persons upon these sections. Then, taking the value of those lands at 50 cents an acre for 3,500,000 acres, that will be considerably over the amount \$1,750,000—in fact, more than double the amount—of \$750,000 which this Parliament is asked to vote for the Island Railway. There is another point which we have to consider, and that is the compensation for delays. I remember, long before I had any idea of entering the political arena, the predecessor of my colleague, Mr. DeCosmos, estimated some three or four years ago, that the Dominion of Canada was indebted to British Columbia in a sum certainly not less than \$2,250,000, as compensation for the delays in railway construction. Now, in this Settlement Bill, we are getting rid of that amount, with accrued interest, and possibly an accumulation of testimony, as to whether that amount should be augmented or not. We are getting 3,500,000 acres in the Peace River country. The matter of \$2,250,000 and the amount to be added to it is to be lost sight of and buried in oblivion, and, in addition to this, we are to get a settlement in full, as I understand, of all existing differences, whatsoever they may be. These differences, of course, are well known to the Government. They are equally well known, I think, to a good many members of this House. The former hon. members for Vancouver and Victoria (Messrs Bunster and DeCosmos) have repeatedly pressed our