

This superiority, it was shown existed, notwithstanding the fact—all important in view of the aforementioned comparisons made in Ontario—that, since 1873, the public lands of Vancouver on the East and South Coasts had been reserved from sale or alienation in consequence of the decision, that year, of the Macdonald administration to "locate a railway line from Esquimalt harbor to Seymour Narrows."

Now must briefly be noticed a few of the many matters—mostly irrelevant—brought up by the *Mainland Guardian*, in its two editorials on that letter.

RIVAL ROUTES.

The *Guardian* views the subject of rival routes "as worn threadbare; as to the mind of any intelligent person, the question has been finally settled." Not so have I read the last report of Engineer-in-Chief Fleming, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, 1877. Not so have I understood the purport of the two last published dispatches to our Government from Earl Carnarvon.

ACCURACY.

It matters not where any particular Islander, or any one or more Mainlanders, may have their personal interests. All are alike bound to aim at strict accuracy in statements publicly made on the railway terminus question, and it is the imperative duty of any one, aware that, on such a vitally important question, inaccurate and misleading representations have been published, to call these in question, in order that, by free discussion, the truth may be elicited and if necessary "proclaimed from the house tops." There is no earthly need of, as the *Guardian* hints, stirring up sectional strife. Nothing is more undesirable or ridiculous. There need be no strife save that of sound argument based on the inexorable logic of such facts as "winna ding and daurna be disputed."

MISTAKES OR INACCURACIES.

An inaccuracy to be noted occurs in the *Toronto Weekly Globe*. April 13, 1877, p. 256, under the caption "Pacific Railway." The real choice (says the writer) "will to all appearance, lie between Bute Inlet and Burrard Inlet, each of which has some advantages in its favor. If the railway is ever to be constructed to Esquimalt along Vancouver Island, it becomes a matter of necessity to adopt Bute Inlet as the present terminus. As a military road this line would be the most serviceable, since a line along the Fraser valley would be for a considerable distance in close proximity to the Canadian frontier. But the latter has the advantage in respect both of distance and the harbor at its terminus." The italics are mine.

The author of the foregoing leader in the *Globe* had probably read a letter in the *London Times* of last January or early in February, dated New Westminster, British Columbia, December 4th, 1876, and signed "Old Settler." The *Globe* scribe had also, perhaps, heard or read the statement in the House of Commons, Ottawa, by Mr. Dewdney,

M. P., on the 6th April, 1876, that (his words are quoted) "the navigation from the southern extremity of Vancouver Island to Burrard Inlet is excellent."

"Old Settler's" letter does not overflow with the milk of human kindness towards Victoria or Victorians; but let that alone as far as may be. The following quotation is, however, unavoidable. "A good route (O. S. says) has been found passing through, or close to, the settled parts of the Province, and terminating at the magnificent harbor of Burrard Inlet—a harbor capable of containing all the navies of the world, with plenty of room to spare; a harbor which Victorians in their blind rage stigmatize as difficult and dangerous of access, but into which sailing ships have been brought under sail and without a pilot."

ATTEMPTED CORRECTION OF MISTAKES.

Now will "Old Settler," over his "nom de plume," or, as he may prefer, kindly inform the readers of *THE COLONIST*, how many shipmasters, in the last twelve years he has known to bring their vessels into Burrard Inlet from the Fucan Straits without a pilot? how many of these to go out without a pilot, and how many to repeat the venture of sailing in from the Straits, through the intricate channels of the Haro Archipelago, across the Gulf of Georgia and through the dangerous Narrows at the entrance of the Inlet—but 300 yards wide at one place? Since 1871 I have sought information from every source, relative to the principal harbors of this Province, that prima facie, seemed suitable for the Western terminus of the British Transcontinental Railway. As to the sailing of ships from Royal Roads to Burrard Inlet with or without a pilot, two instances thereof have come to my knowledge, but these vessels, small in size, were piloted if not towed out. There may have been a few other like cases. I have been told of shipmasters having come to grief in making the attempt. The rule now is for vessels to be towed to and fro. Far indeed is Burrard Inlet from being the extensively capacious harbor "Old Settler," the *Guardian* editor, and others would have the world imagine. Instead of, as they assert, having room for the navies of the world, it has of good anchorage at Granville, or Coal Harbor, only about 1 square marine mile in extent, and, off Moodyville, north shore, only about $\frac{1}{2}$ a square marine mile in extent. In English Bay there are about 3 square marine miles; but that roadstead is exposed from W. S. W. to W. N. W., whence the strongest winds blow from the Gulf of Georgia, and, with northerly winds, there is a long fetch of sea in from the Gulf. Here ships anchor with their tugs, while awaiting turn of tide, ere they pass through the Narrows to Burrard Inlet.

The remaining space or mid-channel of the Inlet outside the second Narrows is unsafe for anchorage owing to the strength of its tidal currents and eddies. It is from about 20 to 30 fathoms in depth.

Esquimalt has, with the exception of a few spots, some day to be dredged, of safe anchor-