

as equivalent to saying that this Province was willing that the railway should be abandoned if the construction involved the slightest increase of taxation? But even if Mr. Trutch had approved of this resolution, are the people of British Columbia to be seriously told that they are to be bound by a resolution altering the terms of Union, because of remarks made, in the course of an after-dinner speech, by a gentleman who had been, but who was no longer a delegate; and are they unreasonable when they get angry at such futile arguments being pressed upon them?

Another argument which has been used in favour of repudiation is, that the treaty of Union with British Columbia was made by a Government which, as shown shortly afterwards, did not represent the people of Canada. Such an argument can hardly be seriously dealt with. What would be thought of any country which repudiated a treaty because, after the treaty had been made, the Government changed before it was carried out. Suppose, for example, the Conservatives in England had come into power after the Treaty of Washington had been signed, but before the Alabama claims had been paid, what would have been said had the Government refused to pay the claims on the ground that Mr. Gladstone's Ministry, when it made the treaty, did not represent the people of England? Would not a nation which acted in this way incur the derision and contempt of the whole civilized world?

Lastly, we are told that it is absurd to expect Canada to carry out her treaty obligations, because the people of British Columbia are so few in number. This argument irresistibly reminds one of the unfortunate servant girl who told her mistress that she could not be much blamed, because her baby was such a very little one. If it is repudiation for Canada, having induced British Columbia to join her on certain conditions, to turn round and refuse to carry out those conditions, that repudiation is just as great and just as disgraceful, whether there be a million or a thousand people in British Columbia.

There is a large party in Canada which advocates a partial repudiation, contending that although the Pacific Railway should be built at some future time, yet that at present it ought only to be built from the east as

population extends; and that the portion west of the Rocky Mountains should be built last, and only when the trade with the east would warrant its construction. It was an important part of the original terms of Union that the railways should be commenced at both ends simultaneously, and in the modification of the terms which was agreed to by Lord Carnarvon's arbitration, it was settled that the railway should be commenced in British Columbia at the earliest possible time the Government could fix upon a route, and that from that time a sum of at least two millions should be spent annually on the Pacific side, in construction. It would seem then, that those who advocate this mode of constructing the railway, are as much open to the charge of repudiation as those who wish to abandon the railway altogether.

We have recently heard of some strong remarks made in Canada regarding the way in which the United States are breaking the terms of the Treaty of Washington, and Mr. Mackenzie excited a hearty feeling of approval throughout the country when he said that "it is useless to expect from the Americans an enlightened fulfilment of treaty obligations." What if the United States were to turn round and say to Canada, "How are you keeping your treaty obligations? You made a treaty with British Columbia that if she would join your Confederation, you would build a railway to the Pacific; you now refuse to build it if it should even to the slightest extent increase your taxation; and a large part of your people, if we may judge from your newspapers, advocate the complete abandonment of the enterprise, and an utter repudiation of the treaty of union with British Columbia."

We shall now endeavour to show that, besides the avoidance of that dishonour and loss of credit which would necessarily attach to Canada, if she were to give cause to British Columbia to proclaim aloud to the world that she had been swindled into Confederation, she would find—and that too before long—that it was immensely to her advantage to carry out faithfully her treaty obligations, and that the adage, "Honesty is the best policy," is as equally applicable to nations as to individuals.

Having touched upon the political and commercial importance of the acquisition of British Columbia, we will now show the financial advantages which would result from