

The Weekly British Colonist. Wednesday February 2, 1870.

The "Times" on the Colonies. In another column will be found a communication upon a subject of considerable importance. Let us, in the first place, crave indulgence while we set our correspondent right in regard to the attitude of this journal. The position of the Governor has scarcely been defined as that of a partisan instructed to effect Confederation with Canada whether the people desire it or not. It may appear to serve a purpose to put the case in that form; yet facts do not justify it. What we have said and still say is this: It is the known policy and determination of Her Majesty's Government to form one great empire out of the scattered possessions in North America. The Governor, as the Representative of the Queen, is instructed to promote that policy in so far as this colony is concerned; and there is little reason to think that a few refractory hundreds would be permitted to stand in the way of the great Confederation scheme for it must be remembered that without British Columbia the whole thing must fall to the ground. The Governor is not expected to address breathing an ardent desire for Confederation, would tell the colonists that Her Majesty was prepared, if need be, to employ a little gentle coercion. To imagine anything of the kind would have been as impolitic as gratuitous. The language in which our correspondent defines the colonial policy of the British Government is somewhat strained, and expresses too much. We equally anticipate the freedom of action on the part of the official members in voting upon Confederation at the approaching session. The second accusation brought against this journal has not, we are bound to say, the slightest foundation in fact. These columns have ever been open to the free and fair discussion of the subject of Annexation; nor have we forgotten what is due to the opinions of those who may differ from us as to what is a proper expression of such opinions in the terms of loyal or treasonable. We have learned to respect the opinions of others too highly, and to place too much importance upon the right of freedom of discussion to be capable of perpetrating any such impertinent folly. Where does our correspondent find the Colonial Minister plainly intimating that England desired to part with some of her most distant colonies? Nowhere, unless in the columns of some unreliable paper like the Times. Ready enunciation of the colonial policy of the Empire goes to show that while Great Britain earnestly desires to retain her colonies, she will not retain them by force. More than this has never been intimated by any person or paper representing the Government. It is asserted that Great Britain has held this colony at a loss for twenty years. We are greatly puzzled to know how that can be, seeing she has uniformly refused to expend a single dollar in its behalf, while the regiment of her placemen it has fed may not unreasonably be accounted an Imperial gain. Loss, indeed! What loss has Great Britain ever sustained by this colony? Our impression has been that the balance lies on the other side of the ledger. There is no reason to doubt that, under Confederation, the Naval station will come back. They can easily be secured as a condition. The allusion to our right to frame commercial tariffs is a piece of special pleading unworthy of the author. Do not all the colonies enjoy the same right? Do not the most important of them enjoy the right more fully than we? Have they not enjoyed it in bygone years, when the colonial policy of the Empire was less permeated by infidelity and tainted by "shop"? How, then, can we accept that circumstance as a proof of our insignificance in Imperial estimation? If it proves anything at all, it proves the very reverse. Our correspondent entirely misconstrues Mr Gladstone upon the subject of Imperial guarantees. During last session, when the subject of guaranteeing loans for the Dominion was under consideration, Mr Gladstone laid down the axiom concerning such guarantees that they should not be given except for Imperial purposes. Conformably with this, Parliament guaranteed Canada an loan to the extent of over five million dollars. Now, in order to understand the meaning and intention of the words "except for Imperial purposes," we have only to look at the objects for which the Canadian loans were raised, viz. to build the Intercolonial Railway, and to pay for new territory, the acquisition of which was deemed necessary to the completion of the Confederation scheme. Would the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway be less entitled to be regarded as falling

within the line of exceptions set up by Mr Gladstone? We think not; and here we have reason for believing ourselves in perfect accord with Imperial sentiment. It was only the other day that we found a much more reliable London paper than that quoted by our correspondent, adopting this view; and the last English mail brings to us a statement made by a member of Her Majesty's Government, confirmatory of what might well be gathered from Lord Granville's despatch to our own Governor, viz. that so soon as the Northwest difficulty shall have been arranged in the Dominion, the Imperial Government will devote itself to the promotion of continuous railway communication. We observe, not without surprise, the light estimation in which our correspondent holds "responsible government." Under Confederation our powers of self-government would be co-extensive with those possessed by a State of that Union which appears singularly attractive to some persons; and we would experience no little difficulty in believing our correspondent to be so ill-informed upon the subject as his contemptuous remarks would seem to imply. There is one passage in the communication which we confess to having read with considerable surprise. Our correspondent tells us that his has been "addicted in the belief that national distinctions are but relics of barbarism, that the less civilized a nation, the more clanlike it is, and that all such existing lines of demarcation are becoming perceptibly fainter, under the combined influences of education, the press, electricity and steam." When one finds a polygamist in Utah and a free love man in New York, it is perhaps "surprising" to be wondered at that a "believer" in international free love, if one may be permitted the expression, should be found on Vancouver Island. We have not the advantage of knowing in what school our correspondent acquired his education; but, for ourselves, we were educated to regard that sentiment commonly called "loyalty" as the cement which binds individuality into a homogeneous nation. It may, indeed, degenerate into mere "clannishness," as sometimes happens with the fellow-countrymen of our correspondent. As one of our modern poets has said, "Loyalty is the sinew of a nation." Loyalty is the sinew of a nation, and it is the sinew of a nation that binds it into a homogeneous nation. It is a principle, doubtless, implanted in the human breast for wise purposes—a principle essential to national existence. And here, again, do we find history and facts strangely at variance with the "assessments" of our correspondent. In what country has education, the press, electricity and steam had a more signal triumph than in the United States? Have we seen the national "lines of demarcation" becoming "perceptibly fainter" under these influences? Nay, where is there another country on the face of the earth, in which these national distinctions are more marked? If we look to our own and other European nations, we do not find these lines becoming fainter as civilization progresses. Yet we are told that loyalty, patriotism, is more clannishness—a relic of barbarism. It ill befits those proposing to become citizens of the United States to hold such sentiments. Such latitudinarianism may do to live by in a British Colony; but it would scarcely qualify for citizenship in the Great Republic. But the most pardonable error into which our correspondent has fallen is that of supposing that the Times represents either the Government or people of Great Britain upon the colonial question.

City Council. Tuesday, Jan. 15, 1870. Council met at 7 1/2 o'clock. Present: The Mayor, and Councillors McKay, Russell, Gerow, Carey, Walker, Allison. Communication from J. W. Williams, claiming a refund of pound less for the reason that there was no poundkeeper at the time the animals were seized, and that the horses were not properly cared for. Councillor Russell moved that a committee be appointed to investigate the matter. Councillor Walker seconded and the motion was carried. Councillor Gerow rose to suggest a Committee of the Whole. The Mayor—There is no use in such a motion. What is the use of having a dispute over everything that comes up? I alone have the power to appoint committees, and I appoint Councillors Russell, McKay and Allison. Councillor McKay asked leave to withdraw on personal grounds and the Mayor appointed Councillor Carey. Communication from H. Rhodes calling attention to the dangerous state of Cormorant Street near the Orleans Hotel. Referred to Street Committee. Councillors Carey and Gerow here called attention to the 32d Section of the Municipal Ordinance, which gives the Council power to appoint committees. Councillors Russell and Walker from the Street Committee, reported that there were no dangerous sidewalks on Cormorant Street between Quebec and Douglas streets, but thought that a temporary walk should be laid in places where a permanent one is not yet laid. The Clerk was instructed to write to the property owners and call their attention to the Ordinance. Councillor Russell reported the view street drain out of order, and his repair was ordered. Consideration of the motion for an increase of the Clerk's salary, was postponed for one week. The impression of the Council is that the Clerk is greatly underpaid, and the Mayor and all the Councillors bore testimony to his capability and industry. The Widow's Cow, which everyone thought the Pound Law had effectually smothered, has come to life and again stalks the streets, seeking whom she may toss. Yesterday she ventured upon Yates' street, where she was beset by a gang of yelling vagabonds dogs, which have also taken advantage of the temporary relaxation of the law to draw from their hiding-places. We have not heard of any forays on cabbage gardens; but citizens had better prepare for a siege. DEATH.—Andrew Phillips, formerly owner and captain of the colonial schooner Alpha, wrecked about two years ago near Barclay Sound, buried a blood vessel while on board the steamer Olympia on Sunday evening and died in a few minutes. Phillips was a Scotchman by birth, and was a member of British Columbia Lodge, F & A. M. of this city. NEWS.—Our delayed dispatches contain the news of importance. The wires across the continent have been buried for seven days' incessant gigantic snow-drifts. The latest dispatches received at Portland on Friday were from San Francisco, and they only brought an item or two of the 15th. DIRECT STEAM COMMUNICATION.—A memorial was in circulation yesterday, and numerously and influentially signed, asking his Excellency to provide direct steam communication with San Francisco—a communication which shall be satisfactory and beneficial in its character. SALE OF THE BAR HYVE.—This splendid business property, together with the saloon and hotel buildings, will be offered at auction by Mr Franklin on Friday. In view of the anticipated immigration the sale possesses great importance to persons seeking either a permanent or speculative investment. THE STEAMER ELIZA ANDERSON, with a small Washington and Oregon mail and express, came in at daylight yesterday morning, and left again at 11 1/2 o'clock for ports on the Sound. THE PRINCE OF WALES.—This bark has commenced discharging on the Hudson Bay Company's wharf at Esquimaux. Goods for Victoria consignees will be brought around to this city on Friday. ACCIDENT TO A CHILD.—A little girl, daughter of Mr O. E. Bunting, fell and broke her right arm yesterday morning. The little sufferer received prompt medical attention. THE STEAMER EMMA ARRIVED FROM Burrard Inlet last evening, bringing the Great Maximilian, who returns after a most successful professional visit to the lower river. THE OREGONIAN ANNOUNCES THE demise of Capt John H. Couch, who settled at Point land in 1843. ALEXANDER.—The schooner Discovery was raised a day or two ago at Thetis Island and sailed into the harbor yesterday. The damage is slight. THE WRECKED BARK Maria J. Smith has been seen afloat south of Cape Flattery, and a steamer has been dispatched to tow her inside the Straits. MARINE FUNERAL.—The remains of Alexander Phillips will be interred to-day with Masonic honors. It costs five dollars to keep a dog at Seattle. There are only 26 licensed canines in the place. Happy land! BOSS CREE, Idaho Territory, has been again nearly destroyed by fire. THE schooner Eliza, laden with stone for the new French Hotel, arrived yesterday.

Annexation v. Confederation. BOSTON BRITISH COLONIST.—As the Legislature will probably assemble for the dispatch of business, I crave a little of your valuable space to draw attention to what I conceive to be two misapprehensions and one inculcated in your columns, and by dint of repetition calculated to mislead the public in a matter deeply affecting their future welfare. The first is—That the position here offered our new Governor is that of a partisan, instructed to effect Confederation with Canada whether the people here desire it or not. Such a supposition is wholly unsupported by facts, is virtually contradicted by the replies of the Governor to several addresses, and opposed to the declared policy of the British Government that each colony is at perfect liberty to shape its own destiny as it thinks fit, provided it shall cease to become chargeable to the Mother Country in the event of war; and I confidently anticipate the announcement, at the ensuing session, that official members will be free to vote on this question according to their consciences. The second is—That any discussion on the subject of annexation of this colony with the United States is disloyal if not actually treasonable. Now, Sir, if members of Parliament, in England, both in their places and in addressing their constituents, calmly discuss the effect on the Empire of parting with this or that colony, as we know to be the case; if the Press of England does likewise; if the Colonial Minister plainly intimates that England desires to part with some of her most distant and unprofitable colonies, would it not be more than culpable in us, at the present crisis, not to consider this question in the two-fold aspect, viz. the effect on the Empire and on this colony if so detached? First, then, with regard to the Empire, if by giving to its remotest and poorest geographical position, this colony is a source of weakness and not of strength, to England, commercially unprofitable in peace and indefensible in war, if a separation is earnestly prayed for, at home, a peace-loving and a peace-loving, is it not just possible that we might better display our patriotism by aiding than by opposing separation? Secondly, with regard to its effects upon the colony, if the connection by railway with Canada shall be found to be a financial impossibility, standing as this colony soon will at the terminus of a transcontinental railway ready-made, a brilliant future, might, still be in store for it. I, Sir, have been educated in the belief that national distinctions are but relics of barbarism; that the less civilized a nation, the more clannish it is, and that all such exact lines of demarcation are becoming perceptibly fainter, under the combined influences of education, the press, electricity and steam. But in this case I positively fail to discover a difference between our brethren in Canada and those in the States, unless it be this: Canada is an English colony which has obtained its independence by peaceful means, and the States an English colony which has obtained its independence by a war forced upon it by tyranny and injustice. Are we, to bear the less good-will towards the latter because it underwent such injuries? or ought we not rather to sympathize with it for that very reason? America is in no way a foreign nation. We boast of the same language, we speak the same language, and left our homes under similar circumstances. I doubt whether the extravagant professions of loyalty occasionally indulged in here, at the expense of our colonies, would be fully appreciated at home. It too often more resembles the proffered caresses of an inebriated acquaintance than the less obtrusive intimations of a valued friend. According to my humble interpretation of public opinion so openly expressed at home, the case with us stands thus: The British taxpayer will not allow us to continue a distinct dependency of Great Britain, but leaves us absolutely free to make what other alliances we please. Great Britain has held this colony at a loss for twenty years, has at length abandoned all idea of making a Naval Station here, on account of the difficulty of retaining sailors in a gold country and having no commercial interests here to protect; in fact, so insignificant do they consider the latter, that they allow us to frame a tariff, which, distance being taken into account, places the introduction of British goods at a decided disadvantage in competing with American. But how in the event of war? Would England expend 30 millions sterling on a railway to hold a dependency commercially valueless, in opposition to the unmistakable statement of Mr Gladstone, that no guarantee would be given in future for any such purpose? Indian Railways afford no parallel; in that case the most valuable dependency of Great Britain could not have been held unless the guarantee were given, besides, the former line would run closely parallel to a foreign frontier, and therefore liable to interruption, with a small force at a hundred points, and fortifications are out of the question, since it is an established principle that colonial fortifications must be made at the cost of the colony interested and not of the British public. (See Political Article, Edinburgh Review, No. CCLXII.) In proposing terms for Confederation you appear to urge two points as essential, Responsible Government, and That Railway. The former, I have no doubt, could be readily granted; commercial tariffs, &c. being placed beyond our reach, the only matter left open to us to discuss, would be the holes in the Spanish road, apprehension of whiskey sellers or the appointment of a keeper for the Public Pound. The second condition, if conceded, seems to open a more gratifying prospect. I imagine an expenditure of 20 or 30 millions on a work commenced simultaneously at both ends; a fleet of vessels arriving at our wharves laden with railway plant and rolling stock; a regiment of engineers and contractors with their families, and an army of laboring men. The cheering prospect is, however, damped by one or two drawbacks; and here, I am sorry to say, the opinion of the best informed men in England is strangely at variance with the tone of some brilliant leading articles in your paper. To construct some thousands of miles of railway through an uninhabited country, some population at one end and none at the other, where is the money to come from? Canada

has not got it, neither has British Columbia. The British Government won't guarantee a shilling. The British public find that railways at home do not on an average pay 3 per cent. Some are in Chancery, and some petitioning government to aid them in their distress. And, further, it is said that the existing overland railway, notwithstanding the dense population at both ends, and with the steam communication with Ohio and Japan does not pay. If, then, the proposed connection by railway with Canada is all moonshine we might as well for all practical purposes be confederated with the Pyramids of Egypt. About one necessary condition, however, your fields are strangely silent, I mean the Alabama claims, or England, about the 30 000 invaders from San Francisco would be landed on our shores three weeks after war was declared. Would you expect a Canadian Hannibal to lead an army across the mountains to our rescue? Your Red River correspondence would not infer it. Ironclads from Denver or a fleet from it. Hamodze would be six months coming out if sent, all postal communication cut off, and British subjects confined to quit in a fortnight or remain prisoners of war till the war was over. The foregoing and similar considerations will throw some light upon the frank liberty of purpose which dictated the following passage extracted from a recent leading article in the Times; "The government's organ, as well as the exponent of public opinion in England at the present time:—We can suggest a stronger statement. British Columbia is a long way off. It is practically inaccessible by land from Canada, and, in spite of many projects to the contrary, will long remain so. The way of getting at it is by the Isthmus of Darien and the Pacific and the nearest civilized community is the State of California. With the exception of a limited official class, it receives few emigrants from England, and a large proportion of its inhabitants consist of citizens of the United States who have entered it from the South. The Colonial Secretary has recently intimated to the Governor of British Columbia that he is prepared to sanction the entrance of the colony into the new Dominion of Canada should the colonists desire it. Nothing could be more proper than this intimation; but suppose the colonists met together, and after deliberating came to the conclusion that they were, as we have said, a very long way off from the United Kingdom, and practically almost as far from Canada, and that every natural motive of continuity, similarity of interests, and facility of administration induced them to think it more convenient to slip into the Union than into the Dominion. Should we oppose their determination? We all know we should not attempt to withstand it if it were clearly and intelligently pronounced. The simple fact, then, in the relations between this country and British Columbia, far from being a source of weakness to the latter, is a source of strength. The nearest civilized community is the State of California. With the exception of a limited official class, it receives few emigrants from England, and a large proportion of its inhabitants consist of citizens of the United States who have entered it from the South." There is too much truth in the statement that the Colony receives few emigrants from England; but that circumstance is mainly attributable to the gross ignorance which pervades the home mind with respect to it,—a condition in no way mitigated by the incessant blundering of an ill-informed and jaundiced press. It will scarcely be necessary to say that, with this single exception, the statements contained in the above extract are utterly, ridiculously untrue. By the Isthmus of Darien is not the only way here. The State of California is not the nearest civilized community. Washington Territory, on our immediate border, has a white population nearly twice as large as British Columbia; yet, perhaps, in view of the recent doings of Judge Lynch, the less said about civilization in that Territory the better. But what of the State of Oregon, with its hundred thousand, a population, equal in civilization to that of California? Probably our big cotemporary was not aware that Oregon intervenes; but if so, he ought not to venture beyond his depth; he ought to study geography before presuming to write leading articles upon such subjects. The assertion that a large proportion of the inhabitants consist of citizens of the United States who have entered from the South, is equally wide of the mark. The fact is that, elementary although valuable and interesting, is small, probably not amounting to more than a fifth of the civilized population of the Colony. The predominant element is composed of British subjects who, having either lived in other Colonies, or in the United States, know what the rights of freemen are, and mean to enjoy them here, and we have no hesitation in saying that if they cannot enjoy those rights under the old flag there are few who would not, however reluctantly, seek them under another. It has already been asserted that the Times does not represent the views and policy of either the Government or people of Great Britain on the Colonial question. In proof of this assertion we need only refer our readers to such papers as the Telegraph (the organ of Mr. Gladstone), the Standard [the organ of the Conservative party], the Post, the Globe, the Daily News, the Advertiser, the Dispatch, the Spectator, the Pall Mall Gazette, and last, but by no means least, the Observer, as well as the official utterances

The Weekly British Colonist. Wednesday February 2, 1870. Perhaps amongst all the great London newspapers there is not one respecting which it cannot be asserted with more force of truth than in any of the Times that it is "avowedly the government organ as well as the exponent of public opinion in England at the present time"; and this is especially true as respects the Colonial policy of the Empire. It is questionable whether there can be found in all England a newspaper in the columns of which greater ignorance is displayed respecting the Colonies. In illiberality and inconsistency the Times is peerless. Such assertions may appear strange to some; but they are not less true for that. It will be within the recollection of many of our readers how that paper formerly denounced in unmeasured terms the supposed Colonial policy of what was called the Manchester School. At the meeting of Colonists in London on the 8th ult., Mr. Lebelliere, quoted, amidst cheers and laughter, an article from the Times, written six years ago, condemning in the strongest terms, as absurd and ridiculous, the very idea of separating the Colonies from England, describing in glowing terms the commercial and political advantages resulting from the union, and assuring the Colonists that no administration and no minister would ever dare attempt to deprive them of their birthright as Englishmen. [Standard report 9th Dec. 1869] Now the same paper quite out Herod Herod in the denationalizing doctrine of disintegration—goes altogether beyond the Bright party in estimating lightly the value to the nation of its colonial empire. This from such a source can surprise no one; but it is surprising to find the government organ as well as the exponent of public opinion in England at the present time. Let us look for a moment at the Times' article to which the communication published yesterday doubtless owes paternity. Passing over the patronizing supercilious, insulting tone assumed towards the Colonists who, with the Duke of Manchester, sought an interview with the Colonial Minister, we find the Times telling its readers with regard to this Colony that "The way of getting at it is by the Isthmus of Darien and the Pacific, and the nearest civilized community is the State of California. With the exception of a limited official class, it receives few emigrants from England, and a large proportion of its inhabitants consist of citizens of the United States who have entered it from the South." There is too much truth in the statement that the Colony receives few emigrants from England; but that circumstance is mainly attributable to the gross ignorance which pervades the home mind with respect to it,—a condition in no way mitigated by the incessant blundering of an ill-informed and jaundiced press. It will scarcely be necessary to say that, with this single exception, the statements contained in the above extract are utterly, ridiculously untrue. By the Isthmus of Darien is not the only way here. The State of California is not the nearest civilized community. Washington Territory, on our immediate border, has a white population nearly twice as large as British Columbia; yet, perhaps, in view of the recent doings of Judge Lynch, the less said about civilization in that Territory the better. But what of the State of Oregon, with its hundred thousand, a population, equal in civilization to that of California? Probably our big cotemporary was not aware that Oregon intervenes; but if so, he ought not to venture beyond his depth; he ought to study geography before presuming to write leading articles upon such subjects. The assertion that a large proportion of the inhabitants consist of citizens of the United States who have entered from the South, is equally wide of the mark. The fact is that, elementary although valuable and interesting, is small, probably not amounting to more than a fifth of the civilized population of the Colony. The predominant element is composed of British subjects who, having either lived in other Colonies, or in the United States, know what the rights of freemen are, and mean to enjoy them here, and we have no hesitation in saying that if they cannot enjoy those rights under the old flag there are few who would not, however reluctantly, seek them under another. It has already been asserted that the Times does not represent the views and policy of either the Government or people of Great Britain on the Colonial question. In proof of this assertion we need only refer our readers to such papers as the Telegraph (the organ of Mr. Gladstone), the Standard [the organ of the Conservative party], the Post, the Globe, the Daily News, the Advertiser, the Dispatch, the Spectator, the Pall Mall Gazette, and last, but by no means least, the Observer, as well as the official utterances