

works at all named in the conditions. I state that the insertion of Esquimalt in the Government Resolutions was not governed by sectional prejudices. The Executive Council took the broad view that it was for the interest of the Canadian Government to build this Dock, because if Victoria prospers under Confederation, it will be so much better for the Dominion revenue. If the work is a benefit to Victoria, through bringing labourers, it will benefit the whole Colony, and our position will be improved, and therefore we shall become a more important part of the Dominion. If it pleases the people of Victoria, if they consider it a sufficient inducement to go into Confederation, let them do so. The people of Victoria are here to make money, and not to found empires; their children may perhaps make the kingdoms and empires. If the people like Confederation on these terms, I say let them vote for it.

Hon. Mr. CARRALL, Member for Cariboo—"It may not be intentional, but it is so," were the concluding words of the Hon. Mr. Wood. I say yes, so far as this: that the whole of the conditions of this scheme were intended to benefit the whole of the Colony. As a Member of the Executive Council, I repudiate entirely the narrow motives which have been suggested by the Hon. Mr. Wood. The Executive Council were actuated by no sectional views; their object was to make the whole of the Resolutions not only palatable, but beneficial, to the Colony. The merits of Esquimalt as a site for the Docks are in themselves a sufficient reason to advance in favour of the Executive opinion being correct. I shall vote for the clause as it stands.

Hon. Mr. DECOSMOS—I am one of those who think it proper to have the locality for the Docks named; and I think the Government would have made a blunder if they had left out the word "Esquimalt." It would have been wrong, in my opinion, if the Government had framed the Resolutions with any sectional views. But it appears to me whilst they are likely to do the Colony good generally, they have been framed with a tendency to create the popular vote, and I do not see much harm in that. The point which I want to hear about is, whether £100,000 will be sufficient to construct a good Dock, and what sort of a Dock it is to be? It is possible that a large Stone Dock may not be of so much use as a Patent Slip. I have visited the Floating Docks in the Arsenals of the United States, to take such observations as would serve an unprofessional man; and I confess that if it is to be a Stone Graving Dock in Constance Cove, to admit of one vessel at a time, I am inclined to the opinion that it would not be as good, nor as much public utility, as a Patent Slip. I shall support the item, or a larger sum than £100,000. I believe that a Dock, or a Patent Slip, at Esquimalt, will attract ships from Puget Sound. It is a step in the right direction. There is a feeling abroad that the Colony would have to construct this Dock. This would be a mistake; but to get Canada to endorse the scheme, by giving a guarantee for the interest, is, in my opinion, the right course to pursue.

Hon. Mr. TRUTCH—That is the intention; that a private company should undertake the work, the Dominion giving a guarantee. It will be left for the company to choose. Probably Clarke's Patent Slip, with hydraulic lift, would be the easiest worked, as it would be the cheapest. It could probably be erected for £75,000, whereas a cut stone Graving Dock would cost more. One of the advantages of the latter would be that there would be more money expended in the Colony during its construction, whereas the principal cost of a Patent Slip would be expended elsewhere for machinery. I cannot say if £100,000 would be enough for the construction of a cut stone Dock or not. I think that a guarantee of 5 per cent. on £100,000 will be a sufficient inducement for any company to take the matter up. I am convinced that £100,000 will not build a stone Dock of sufficient capacity to take in such a ship as the Zealous.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—If the people of Victoria desire the terms, why should not they vote for Union? My desire is, if we are to be united, to see a union which shall be lasting. I say that these terms are not lasting. They are in the nature of direct and immediate pecuniary advantage. Reaction will set in after the Railway and Dock are built. Show me in these terms continuing and abiding benefit, and I am satisfied. Let the people of Victoria choose, but I ask Hon. Members, who understand human nature, whether the people would not choose direct benefit in preference to prospective and continuing advantages. Mankind will choose direct present pecuniary benefit, rather than that benefit which is to be lasting and remote. I fear reaction. I look upon this place as my home, and shall complain, I think with justice, if ten years hence I find a great reaction of the present hasty action.