

Coast, except that produced by the discovery of gold, as has been proved since the opening of the Pacific railroad. Take the protection then from our farmers, and they are reduced to the condition of the agriculturists to the south of us, who will be reduced to the condition of those in the east. No doubt the prices of our farmers will be reduced by the revolution that is going on, but give them protection against foreign competition, and there will still be inducement for them to remain. The Hon. Chief Commissioner referred to this in a very proper spirit; and the Hon. Member for New Westminster says that it is one of the most important questions. I hope, therefore, that the subject will have due weight with them.

The Government of Canada, according to the proposed terms, would give a surplus revenue of \$200,000. [Dr. Helmecken, No.] The Hon. Member says no. He may be right. But upon the calculation that we shall have \$200,000 surplus revenue, I say that this subsidy will be equivalent to four hundred farmers, who earn in the Colony \$500 each, annually. By taking off protection from our farmers, to get the \$200,000, we would injure the country instead of benefiting it. But get the surplus of \$200,000, and at the same time protection for our farmers, and we will do a prosperous business under Confederation. This is what we have to arrange. What we have to get into the terms. [Dr. Helmecken, "All right! I will help you."] I would say that "extremes meet," for I now meet my Hon. friend (I mean political enemy) [No, no, no,] to secure protection. I am not a Member of the Hon. Member's City, but we can get all we want without Confederation by a judicious arrangement of our own tariff. I can show, that what we want most in this Colony, is population, and that population employed in a remunerative manner. Isolation will not secure population. Confederation on proper terms will give us population; will give us means to employ labour remuneratively; will enlarge our commerce, and build up our industry. It gives us public works,—if it give us a railroad from a point on the Fraser, below Yale, to Savona's Ferry on Lake Kamloops,—and if we connect Lake Okanagan with the Spel-mah-chen River, by railway, which is only about thirteen miles,—not only will the whole country from Okanagan lake, on the boundary, behind the Cascades, be opened up and connected with our chief commercial city, with a cheap and speedy means of transportation; but all this tract of country traversed by the railways and lake communication will be utilized in producing wheat and wool, and other articles for exportation. Victoria, then, will be built up, and will be the chief commercial city of British Columbia, with all other parts of the Colony tributary to her. This is what Confederation on proper terms will do for us. The Hon. Member for Victoria said, that no lasting union could be maintained, unless the interests of British Columbia are preserved. If I look (for argument sake) at these things from a Canadian point of view, I find that by serving the interests of British Columbia, the interests of Canada will be served. Canada, as well as British Columbia, will benefit by a protective duty here. Canada will get the revenue under protection, and British Columbia will have its industry protected from foreign competition. And there is no reason that we should not have our interests protected. [Dr. Helmecken—"The Organic Act says no."] The Organic Act says no such thing. Confederation is diversity in unity; really and essentially a general unity, and an application of law to diverse interests. First, we find that New Brunswick, under the Organic Act, gets a temporary subsidy of \$63,000 per annum. None of the other Provinces receive any temporary subsidy under that Act. New Brunswick is allowed to collect export dues on lumber. All the other Provinces are prohibited from levying dues on lumber. Now, if New Brunswick gets an additional subsidy, and levies a lumber tax prohibited to the other Provinces, why cannot British Columbia get exemption from uniformity in her favour? Nova Scotia gets two subsidies, equal to \$100,000, which are not in the Organic Act. The Crown lawyers say that the grant is not unconstitutional. This is a noted exception, made to satisfy the Nova Scotia repeal party. Another exception is found in the compulsory provision, that appointments to the Judiciary shall be made from the Bar of the Provinces for which the appointment is made, (till the laws and practice are assimilated). If the Organic Act is wrong, I say change the Act. But, I believe, that I have successfully shown that exceptions have been and can be made under the Organic Act.

Now, let us see what this horrible Canadian tariff is. It is too high on cattle for us; not high enough on bacon, butter, cheese, and lard by a few cents; and imposes nothing on hay, hops, and grain of all kinds. I explained the whole to my constituents, at eleven meetings, and they said, get these few alterations made to suit us, and we will support Confederation. So we must have an alteration. Why, Sir, under the English Constitution different tariffs can be imposed. Look at the difference in the Excise spirit duties that were levied formerly in Scotland and England, for instance. As a lawyer, not as a judge, I give my opinion that we can have one tariff in British Columbia, and another in the Atlantic Provinces, under the Organic Act; and if the Act does not allow it, then we must alter it.

I have already given notice of motion respecting protection for our farmers and manufacturers. I desire to add a resolution to the proposed terms, keeping the power in the hands of the Local Legislature to impose a tax on certain imports, in case the tariff be too low. With respect to brewers, the tariff can easily be arranged so as to protect them; and the Hon. Member for New Westminster has assented the objection to the Dominion fishery laws. As for commerce, that common sense that the Hon. Mr. Wood calls statesmanship, will settle that; for if Confederation would injure the commercial interests of British Columbia, it would also injure the interests of the Dominion.

The Hon. Member for Victoria City has said a great deal about centralization. But I say, Sir, that there must be a centre somewhere. We cannot have it in British Columbia, and a centre would be no worse in Ottawa than in Washington. The Pacific Coast, so far as the United States are concerned, is represented at Washington, which is not so large a city as New York.

Representation is one of the most important elements in free Governments; and as it has been urged by the Hon. Mr. Wood and others, that British Columbia would not be heard in the Canadian Senate or Commons, and that our small delegation would be crushed and out-voted, I will briefly examine the subject. Now, Sir, the whole of the Pacific States of the United States have only twelve Representatives in Congress—6 in the Senate and 6 in the House of Representatives. California has two Senators and three Representatives; Oregon, two Senators and one Representative; Washington Territory, one Delegate; and Nevada, two Senators and one Representative. Now, it is proposed in the Resolutions to grant to British Columbia twelve Members—four in the Senate and eight in the Commons—a number equal to the whole representation of the Pacific States, with 1,000,000 people, in the United States Congress. Again, there are only five States that have more than twelve Members in Congress. They are New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. Take another glance at the representation of the States most remote from Washington. Texas has five Members; Florida, three; Maine, seven; and California, five. Remoteness and small numbers have never caused any of these States to be treated unfairly. Under the popular system of government there, the small States do not go to the wall. Has little Delaware gone to the wall? Has Rhode Island gone to the wall? No; neither would British Columbia go to the wall in the Parliament of Canada. The Government of Canada is based on the popular will; and that is the highest of guarantee that we shall be treated fairly by the Dominion.

I have never heard of Scotland being injured because she had a smaller representation in Parliament than England.

[Hon. Mr. Wood—"Yes, yes. Two revolutions followed immediately upon union."]

Yes; but that don't affect my proposition. A little blood-letting, however, does no harm occasionally. I would not object to a little revolution now and again in British Columbia after Confederation, if we were treated unfairly; far, and away, of those who believe that political hatreds attest the vitality of a State. [Hear, hear.]

The Honourable and learned Member for Victoria says that all power will be taken away by Confederation. Why, Sir, the Hon. gentleman cannot have read the Organic Act. For he will find the exclusive powers of the Dominion are the Provinces clearly set forth in it. Then, Sir, on the question of the fulfilment of the conditions by Canada, there appears to be some misapprehension in the Hon. gentleman's mind. In point of fact we have a guar-