positions of honor and trust. Looking round this council board we see men who have come out to this colony to make their own fortunes and honest; out of them the present members of the Government have been chosen, and out of our present population there can be found an equal number of men who can properly fulfil the duties of the Government. I cannot see that it is impossible to find proper men. If we find men willing to sit in this Council now we shall find plenty ready and anxious to share in the burdens of responsible government. The tendency of the population of population is not an element in this question. The United States has been pointed out to us as an example. I say there is no responsible government in the United States, it is an absolute despotic democracy, absolutely irresponsible to the people every 4 years in four years. There is no such thing as responsibility in the form of government of the United States, the only means of getting rid of a minister is by impeachment. The hon member for Cariboo, in his rambling speech, gives us no new argument against responsible government: he certainly reiterated much that was forcibly put forward by the hon Chief Commissioner. I can well believe that the wheat was left at Cariboo until the chaff came here.

Hon Mr Helmcken—Sir, I have listened to the speeches of the hon Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works and to the hon Government Secretary, and I find them difficult to answer because there is so little in them; the only way would be to have them printed and read them, they carry their answer with them. One hon member says that it rows on numbers; I say that intelligence is the only qualification for responsible government, numbers have nothing to do with it. I feel I am proud in erring with some of the greatest men that England ever produced. The hon Chief Commissioner has submitted that the population, taken man for man, is equal to that of any country. Then I say we have the proper qualification; let us have practical and not theoretical means of governing. What is really the case? Under the present form of government the people have to pay for the privilege and benefit of a few gentlemen sitting round this board. Take away this form of government and make it more liberal, and what is the danger? All the evils we are and truthes have not so far been unelucidated, but from the ambition of the so called educated classes. The people have been the Conservatives who came forward to keep the country quiet; take away the so-called intelligent and educated classes and it will be a great loss, the labouring classes can always supply men to fill their places; but take away the working classes and you kill the world, the educated classes cannot fill their places. In my opinion, sir, the people want practical reading. They have endured too long the law's delay and the science of those in oil e. Why should we come here, year after year, to ask for a change in the form of Government? I think it a responsible government would be a SINE QUA NON of Confederation. I shall move an amendment to that effect.

Hon Dr Helmcken—Great heavens! what terrible things are said and done in the name of the people. To hear hon members talk one would think that they were the people, but the people are quiet while hon members are very loud. I intend to oppose the Government; I do not mean to say much for or against. I take the position that the people can have responsible government when they want it, and their representatives ought to be satisfied to take it when the people really and seriously ask for it. Responsible government has been one of the watchwords of a certain set of politicians who want it to bring on Confederation, government of men for and by the people, without regard to the material interests of the Colony—this cause government by politicians. These gentlemen will sacrifice every benefit to the Colony for responsible government. Confederation to me means terms; to them it means pick ings, offices, place and power. This will be represented I am well aware, as being the result of being in the Executive Council; it is said that there is a great difference between the atmosphere of the two Councils. I acknowledge it. There with closed doors people speak the truth without any an cantrances arguments addressed to the gallery; there people are plain and blunt; there politics really are; here popularity has to be sought. We are told that the people will fight for responsible Government. That is mere nonsense—words only. The honorable member for New Westminster in his able speech erected a very handsome structure, but has most fancy structures, it will be a very expensive one. He wants a Government like Ontario, that is a Government of one House, with eighty members. For a Government of that kind not less than forty or fifty would be absolutely necessary.

Hon Mr Robson—I never said like that of Ontario, but that we wanted the principle of responsible Government as existing in Ontario.

Hon Dr Helmcken—Then why not bring in a scheme embodying it? The true principles of responsible Government can only exist satisfactorily with forty or fifty members in the House. It would cost very little short of $20,000 per annum. That out of the very small amount we are to get from Canada would reduce the amount likely to be available for public works to a fraction. You must have a large number to work responsible Government, or more properly speaking, party Government. If we are to have it, I would not have the heads of Departments responsible to the people, at least not the working heads; it any head of a Department is to be responsible to the people, let it be the political head; but I would make the working heads of Departments permanent. I have found from my experience of the old Vancouver Island Legislative Assembly, that policy frequently changed and turns round. The same thing would happen under responsible Government. If I wished to oppose Confederation I believe that I could not do a better thing towards effecting my object than to vote for responsible Government, but I want to see the more material wants advanced by Confederation. I know that material interests were not the pivot, but that it was place, patronage and office that was wanted. With regard to the present system of Government, it is very easy to say that it is bad, but I have listened to all the speeches and have not heard one word of practical facts finding with the present government—merely the assumption that the people desire change. There desire for change they have been educated to. I acknowledge many faults in the past, but we have now a new Executive, and we are promised a change in the form of government; but this is apart from Confederation altogether. It appears to me that the first thing we have to arrange is the money question, to get our material interests first settled, to make sure that this colony should be pecuniarily better off, to make the question of Confederation now turn upon material interest and not all one material interests to be jeopardized by a cry for responsible government, not to allow responsible government to be the cause to make the public swallow bad and unprofitable terms. All members have acknowledged that "money" is the basis of all government; let us get that money. I would not have the public vote for responsible government and forget or put in the back ground, the money. Place the question upon material terms and the colony will demand profitable terms; but mix it up with responsible government and you get a divided opinion on it, and those who think responsible government everything will vote for that to the exclusion of a pecuniary, or, at all events with unprofitable terms. There are doubtless, many who hope to live upon responsible government, but, sir, responsible government is not food and raiment. The people can live without responsible government but they cannot live upon it. Give them food and raiment first, the rest will follow in natural succession. These few words will give you my reasons for consenting to the arrangement proposed in the conditions. More than this, I am not asked to be responsible government, but I am pledged to representative institutions. The latter have been granted. My mission thus far is fulfilled. I have always asserted that we must take our steps to responsible government gradually. Having representative institutions, we can go on to the other. No one ever stated that the people were unfit to govern themselves, all acknowledge that they have talent enough, but this I do assert, that thus far the people have shown an newildlingness to govern themselves—have taken but little interest in the matter. It is not that they are unfit but unwilling; they prefer looking after their own business rather than their neighbors, and doubtless some of them are from that cause, and it is made out to be a fault. But it has been said that better men would have been found outside. If you have responsible government it will fall into the hands of those who wish to make a living by it. No one has said that it would be economical—it would not be so. It would require at least three ry members to carry on party government, for six weeks at least every year, or $150 per diem for 36 days, which would amount to $5400 and then the mileage would come to as much more, say at least or $10,000. Add to these the salaries of the political heads, say per at $3,000 per annum, and then you have the nice little sum of $20,000 a year. Then, I suppose, each Minister would require a pension when he went out. The real executive officers would remain then as now, and would have to be paid nearly as much as at present. The truth is there would be a great difficulty in getting members, and without a large body of members it could not be carried on. You would find that the best men would avoid politics, and soon there would be very poor Government. There is a great deal of talk about voting away the people's money, but it must be borne in mind that a part of that money, under Confederation will come from Canada, and she will have a right to see it properly expended. There is also a great deal of talk about hon official members voting their own salaries, but would not the same thing be done under responsible government? Have not hon representative members voted themselves salaries this present Session? Don mean to say that if responsible government is not granted we will agitate. I thought that every body was as much in favor of it that the people would rise, it is we must include it in the terms, that there would be employment for every gunsmith in Victoria and yet we are told we will agitate!

Hon Mr Robson—I never said that; I said that the people would agitate.

Hon Dr Helmcken—It is much the same thing, the agitators will do all the business, and they will perhaps be driving the birds for other people once again, if the people really desire responsible government. Why is there any necessity for all this agitation? I submit hon members of the people of Victoria desire it, and things that it can be carried out. Ask the scattered district in the country and they will tell you that they don't care about it, politics often does not run high in the country. I intend to support the Government upon this clause, but I have myself perfectly here to vote for responsible government if I think proper. I want to secure the material interests of the colony. Let the people say whether those material interests will be benefited by Confederation, but to mix up the question of responsible government with it. I am perfectly willing to vote by the division of the people on responsible government, and on Confederation on Terms, separately. My sole desire is to see this country materially benefited if the people want responsibility I will not say nay, but we must have good terms. At the same time responsible government might carry Confederation with very indifferent terms. I am perfectly certain that the movement must have acted wisely in not allowing it terms to be clogged with responsible government. I say don't let responsible government take the place of material benefits.

Hon Mr Carrall—Sir—I rise to take exception to what the hon and learned member for Victoria City said about being hoodwinked or lost to Canada. In my remarks I have never made no efforts catch votes, and no cheap tricks to ingratiate to the galleries, but I advocate would may be unpopular from conviction.

Hon Mr Barnard—Sir—I agree with the hon Chief Commissioner that it is a pity that this question has been brought up so far I had made up my mind to vote for responsible government in its entirety, but the hon member for New Westminster put the question to the hon Attorney-General, who said it must go to the House, upon the hon member for New Westminster and others insisted upon opening the discussion on it again.

Hon Mr Robson—I felt regret that it should be brought up, but when I asked if we could put it off the hon Attorney General said it was too late.

Hon Attorney General—I offered the hon members for Westminster and Lillooet every opportunity for discussing this important question, when a committee was set apart for the purpose.

Hon Mr Trimble—What I did was in consequence of what the hon Attorney General said at the commencement of the debate he invited free discussions, otherwise I should not have put my notice on the board.

Hon Mr Barnard—It was fully impressed on my mind that the question should not be mixed up with the terms. I am astonished at the charge against representative members of trying to force this question upon the House at an inopportune time. I will leave it to the government to say whether it shall be left for another day or go on.

Hon Attorney General—I say, again, now the debate has begun, more than a minute is over, the debate must go on.

Hon Mr Robson—Sir, the course is most unfair on the part of the government members.

Hon Chief Commissioner—I ask if the House decide whether it will go on with the question now or postpone it. It seems to me that the hon Attorney General is resorting to a parliamentary manoeuvre in opposing the motion.

Hon Attorney General—I ask if the hon Chief Commissioner ought to vote on. We shall have a large majority representative members on this question and that is all we want. I say that the Attorney General ought not to vote on this question,