

ment, and you will probably be told "you cannot expect the British Government to tax people at home to make public improvements in British Columbia.

For my own part, I am one of the last men to wish the people of England to be taxed for Colonial improvements. Those who persist in thus representing the matter, only show a lamentable ignorance of political economy and colonial legislation. The theory I have advanced has nothing to do with home taxation for our benefit. Should it be carried out, the People of England will no more be taxed for our benefit than they are taxed at present to pay Mexican bonds! Colonies with *Responsible Governments* make their improvements and develop their resources themselves, that is, they can establish a credit with England the same as the United States or France. They can issue their bonds and pay the interests when due, and pay off or renew the bonds according to the wishes of the lender. Colonies which have no Responsible Government have no Colonial credit and must depend solely on taxation.

The arrangement I now advocate for British Columbia may be thus exemplified:

Suppose we want a wagon road from some point on the Fraser River across the Cascade mountains to the rich valley of the Similkameen, or the Forks of the Thompson and Fraser Rivers. Would it not be better policy to borrow the money and make the burden not more oppressive to ourselves than is just and equal? Would not those who arrive in the colony 20 years hence benefit by these roads? Then why should heavy duties and trying dues be laid on us, as though we only were gainers?

There is one matter in which I perfectly agree with Governor Douglas, and that is "belief in the auriferous wealth of the colony," **THE WEALTH PRODUCIBLE NOT PRODUCED.**

This wealth is greater than people imagine, but *proper men in proper places* are requisite to develop it.

Were this wealth properly represented to the capitalists of England, there would be no trouble in borrowing all we require to bring forth the *varied* wealth of the colony.

Perhaps some sceptic may say this borrowing system must be bad. I refer him to Macaulay's History of England, under William and Mary, and point attention to England's prosperity under "Liberal Government and Responsible Institutions." After accounting for the rise and increase of the national debt, and informing us of the opinion of great men, that "at each stage of its increase England's ruin was predicted," he goes on to say "the prophets of evil were under a double delusion, they erroneously imagined that there was an exact analogy between the case of an individual who is in debt to another individual and the case of a society which is in debt to a part of itself, and this analogy led them into endless mistakes about the system of Funding—they were under an error not less serious, touching the resources of the country. They made no allowance for the effect produced by the incessant progress of every experimental science, and to the incessant efforts of every man to get on in life, they saw that the debt grew and they forgot that other things grew as well as the debt..... Those who confidently predicted that England must sink, first under a debt of forty