

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 Honourable Member for New Westminster has answered the objection to the Dominion fishery laws. As for commerce, that common sense that the Hon. Mr. Woods 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 Honourable 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—six in the Senate and six 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; for I am one 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 Honourable gentleman cannot have read the Organic Act. For he will find the exclusive powers of the Dominion and the Provinces clearly set forth in it. Then, Sir, on the question of guarantee for the fulfilment of the conditions by Canada, there appears to be some misapprehension in the Honourable gentleman's mind. In point of fact, we have a guarantee from the Imperial Government. If the Dominion refuse to keep the terms and repudiate their part of the bargain, we can appeal to the Imperial Government to release us.