

that this is a Government measure, and that it ought to be an open question. Why does he not retire from his seat then? I would not be a candidate for his place. [Dr. Helmcken.—"There are no candidates. The Executive Council are appointed."]

Then I am sorry for the choice that has been made. Why, Sir, the programme settled by Government would leave it virtually an open question by referring the terms to a popular vote. I may have something to say upon that hereafter, but how patriotic will the Honourable gentleman be when he goes outside, and says that this nominative Council, presided over by a paid Colonial Secretary, have done this! How very easy it is for an Honourable gentleman to talk about the autocracy of Government, when it suits him to do so. Look at his conduct in voting supplies. When my Honourable friend on my left (the member for Lillooet) tried to bring in a Bill to repeal the Crown Salaries Acts, was he not choked off by the Honourable member for Victoria City objecting first? But I am only delaying the House. [Hear, hear.] The Honourable Magisterial member for Victoria City says, "hear, hear." Now, Sir, as far as I am concerned the Honourable member has my full permission to withdraw. [Laughter.] I have always been ready to take a British subject vote on this question; but the Honourable member for Victoria has always dissented from that proposal.

The Honourable member for Victoria City has a remarkable way of putting things. But a few days ago he stated in the House of the people with me, only support the Government in getting the terms proposed, all will be right. I quote from the Colonist newspaper of 20th February, 1870, in which the Honourable gentleman is made to say, "I hope the people will support the Government in trying to get terms." He now comes down here and opposes them. [Dr. Helmcken.—"I don't oppose the terms, I oppose Confederation."] A distinction without a difference. The Honourable Executive Councillor says the time is inopportune. I say, Sir, that now is the time. If the new gold discoveries, which have been mentioned in the course of this debate, really exist, now is the time to confederate, and to take means to attract and retain population. Sir, have spent five years of my life in the mining districts of California, and have helped to build up towns after towns; but how are they now? Many of those towns which had their 5,000 inhabitants have almost none now. It will be the same with our gold-mining towns. I fear the Honourable gentleman will always say the time is inopportune, not only before the population arrives, but when it is here, and then it goes. If we can make a good bargain with Canada, by all means let us make it, and make it now. I like the word bargain, it sounds like business. What did the Honourable member for Victoria say at the last election? "Don't let us have Confederation, for we shall have a surplus revenue of \$100,000 in 1869, and we will do better without Confederation." Confederation was inopportune then. There was a large deficit or falling off in the Revenue for 1869, and yet he says it is inopportune now. He said, yesterday, we shall have a reduction of the public debt in 1873, of about \$36,000, and by funding the floating debt make another saving of \$15,000 per year. So that for a paltry saving of \$50,000 three years hence, the confederation question is now inopportune. I am surprised at the Honourable gentleman. First, it is inopportune, because of the present depression; second, inopportune at the last election, because things looked so bright; thirdly, inopportune now, because we can save \$50,000. My predecessor as Minister of Finance, Mr. President, promised great things, but the Governor's Message with the Estimates shows how they have turned out. I do not deal in prophesy, but in facts. Let any one look at Cariboo. Look at Victoria. If we wait for the time to be opportune, we may wait until it is too late. Suppose any unforeseen accident were to happen to our gold mines. If the golden spring is dried up, the golden stream now flows from Cariboo to Victoria will be dried up also. We are asked by the Honourable member for Victoria to wait for the census of 1871. What has the census of Canada to do with the question? The basis of population as set forth in these terms is all fiction. It does not come up to my idea of nation-making. Why not deal with facts? Why set up some legal fiction of John Doe and Richard Roe? I want facts not fiction. Let us base our financial calculations upon facts, and the rest will work itself out satisfactorily. Much has been said, during the debate, about the Red River Territory and its settlement. For my part I don't care if the

Red River difficulty is never settled, so far as it bears on the question before the Council. I believe that the Red River country, and the valley of the two Saskatchewan are not so favorable for settlement as some amongst us are accustomed to assert. But whether the North-west Territory is confederated or not, I go in for Confederation, because I believe we can make terms, and good terms, with Canada. The Honourable member for Victoria City talks of the drawbacks to Confederation arising out of the vast extent of country, and our great distance from the seat of the Federal Government. That will hardly scare anybody, with the example of the United States before us. Next he says that the Dominion is only an experiment, and that it may break up. How often have I heard people predict that the United States, as a nation, must break up, as it was only an experiment. Why, Sir, they forget that the States had existed as separate Governments for one hundred and fifty years before their union. So with the Provinces of the Dominion of Canada, they existed as separate Governments for the last hundred to two hundred years, and Confederation is but the application of long tried principles to a larger territory. Why did not the Honourable member for Victoria City then, when he pointed out defects in the confederation machine, tell us what the great defects in the machine were? He has merely raised up a scarecrow. Then he says it is absurd to ally ourselves to people who were 3,000 miles away; but nothing in his argument showed me that the absurdity was proven. I remember, Sir, that the communication between California and Washington was by Panama and Nicaragua; was California then less to the United States than now? We now can hold communication with Ottawa, by San Francisco and the Pacific Railroad, and will be as near to our central Government as Washington Territory. The Honourable member speaks of people 3,000 miles away, being unable to do as well for us as we could do for ourselves. I believe they could do just as well so far as some general principles are concerned, if we only settled the conditions properly. With regard to the States of the neighbouring Republic getting on better than the Provinces or ourselves, I would ask where is the progress of Washington Territory as compared with our own country? [Dr. Helmcken.—"It contains a much larger population." ] The population is only five thousand voters!

The Honourable gentleman is pursuing the same tedious course as he did in past years, when he opposed reform, when our Government might have been beneficial to the Colony, had it been based on the popular will. He says that the deposition of the Free Port drove people out of the Colony. I take this occasion to state that, in my belief, the deposition of the Free Port was the commencement of the permanent prosperity of this City; and brought in its train the dawning of prosperity throughout the whole district, from Comox to Sooke, which includes the district which I have the honour to represent, and which now numbers six hundred voters, all of whom are prosperous. There, Sir, lies the key-stone of Confederation! If the terms between British Columbia and Canada do not protect the farming interests, the largest and the only permanent interest in this Colony, Confederation will do no good. If it does not protect the farming interest, I vote against Confederation, first, last, and all the time.

It would be most unwise to join Canada without protection. We must have a control over certain imports in the terms, for a protective tariff is the only inducement to farmers to remain upon the soil. We depend upon them to build up a permanent interest in the country, that will last for ever.

We must certainly do want extension of commerce, but the true mode to obtain extension is to add to its volume internally. First, I believe in developing internal trade and industry; next, I believe in external trade. Allow these terms as brought down by the Government to pass, and in a few years you will reduce Victoria to the position of a mere smuggling village. Protection is a necessity. So long as there are nations and national interests, so long will it be necessary to have laws to protect those interests. Allow me, Sir, on this point to say that there is a great revolution in the value of realty, capital, and labour commencing on the Pacific Coast. The equalisation of the value of realty, capital, and labour has commenced. The whole tendency of events in the countries to the south of us, is to equalize the value of labour, of real estate, of capital, of manufactures, and of produce on this Coast with their value on the Atlantic side. No such revolution in values has ever occurred on the Pacific