

Hon ATTORNEY GENERAL—I cannot see the use or necessity for the words “no less.”

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I think the words are important. We might in 1881 be entitled to more or less.

Hon. MR. DRAKE—I hold to 91, because I think it likely we might be reduced if we fix the date at 81.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—I think we ought to fix a minimum number and keep to it, and a date, because I think that when the distrust wears away, British Columbia may be content with three in the Senate, and six in the House of Commons.

The Chairman put the recommendation of the Hon. Mr. Drake, to fill up the blank with the figures “91.” Carried.

The Chairman put the recommendation of the Hon. Mr. Wood, “That the number of members to the Commons should never be less than 8, and to the Senate never less than 4.” Carried.

Clause 13 was then passed as read.

The Committee rose, and reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again on Friday at 1 o'clock.

### Friday, March 18th, 1870.

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I rise to move the adoption of clause 14. These terms, or rather the terms which come back from Canada, will of necessity come before the new electoral body, whose existence His Excellency has shadowed forth, and the particulars as to the division into districts must be left for the decision of that House. It is impossible at present to specify the time.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—Cannot an approximate time be named; besides there are other things upon which the country will want information. Such for instance, as whether the voting for members will be by ballot, and what is to be the qualification of voters. I think it ought to be fixed. The Dominion law is more illiberal than that to which the people of this country have been accustomed. I believe in the ballot, but it will be better to leave it to the constituencies.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—This clause has been left general, that it may be settled by the newly constituted Council.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—If there is a qualification for the House of Commons it must be general for the whole Dominion. At present I believe the qualification is that existing in the Provinces before Union, ultimately there must be qualification for the whole Dominion.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—There is no general law for qualification.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—The clause is indefinite and dangerous. The Dominion qualification will virtually disfranchise half the British settlers in British Columbia. We are legislating in the interests of the people, this ought to be determined at once.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—I believe in British subjects, having a fixed residence, and of a certain age, voting in British Columbia. It should be a residential manhood suffrage.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—We cannot deal with the subject now. It is impossible to divide the colony into districts until we know how many senators we are to have.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—Mr. Chairman, I move a recommendation to strike out the words “if any.”

Hon. MR. WOOD—I think the words ought to stand. The Organic Act says that senators shall be elected for districts, but it may be desirable that senators should be appointed for the whole colony, they are nominated, and nominated because they are the best men that the Governor can obtain. [No, no, no—Hon. De Cosmos.] I believe the Executive are in the best position to know whether the principle of appointing senators is best or whether they should go for the whole colony.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—As this stands it throws the whole power into the hands of the Canadians. The Lieut.-Governor will be a Canadian and will name Canadians. We ought to know by whom these appointments are to be made.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—It is a great pity that these sectional differences should be allowed to prevail. We ought to consider ourselves British Columbians. The Governor General, with the consent of his Council, appoints the Lieut.-Governor, and the Lieut.-Governor, with the advice of his Cabinet, recommends the Senators. [No, no, Hon. Dr. Helmcken.] Yes, it is so; he recommends to the Governor General who appoints. It is a great pity to raise these disputes about Englishmen and Canadians.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—It is all very well to talk that way. I maintain that the Englishmen sitting at this table have said less as to nationality than the Canadians. We want to be governed by British Columbians.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—We had better drop these nationalities.

Hon. MR. WOOD—The hon. member for New Westminster should not be angry because we want to provide against the possibility of ill feeling by timely precaution. ‘Safe bind, safe find.’ When the Governor General appoints Senators, if I understand it right, he appoints the political friends of his Cabinet. If we are to have responsible government there will always be some check, if not we may be in the position of having members selected by the Lieut.-Governor without the assistance of any responsible Cabinet. [Hear, hear, Hon. DeCosmos.] A Canadian Lieut.-Governor will act with the same sort of feeling that the English Government will. Senators will be selected by favoritism, and supporters of Confederation will doubtless be selected in this colony unless we have responsible government and representative institutions in full vigor.

Canadian interests will doubtless be very prominent in this colony, and power acts injuriously on the human mind—it is one of the corrupters of the mind.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I should be sorry to see the words 'if any' struck out; their retention leaves the matter open. Hon. members seem to have forgotten that Senators must be residents of British Columbia. Probably they may be elected on the ground of their having an appreciation of the whole country instead of a section only. It may be that Senators will be appointed for the whole colony.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—After hearing the explanations of the Hon. Attorney General, I feel more desirous to press my recommendation, to show that we from the Mainland desire to have our fair share of representation. I think the words most objectionable.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—I find by the resolutions passed at the conference of delegates in London, that Senators were to be taken from the Legislative Council. We are told by the Government that we are to go into Confederation without responsible government, then we ought to have a guarantee that the first Senators shall be representative men, and that they shall not be chosen by the Governor, and put into office for life without reference to the people.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—I shall move a recommendation that the first Senators shall be nominated by the Legislature.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—The position will be worth \$600. The difficulty will be to get anyone to go there. People are chary of going into the Legislative Council now, and they will not be very anxious to go to Canada. As to choosing Senators from one place it is out of the question. And it is equally out of the question to appoint them by the Legislative Council.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—We are here as the agents of the people, delegates in point of fact, and we are bound to legislate in accordance with the well understood wishes of the people. In reference to having these Senators appointed, we are bound to see what they are and whether the people are likely to approve of our acts.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—Hon. members must remember that these resolutions will be submitted to the people, a much abused term, as the hon. member for Victoria District has truly said, and our common object must be to make the terms acceptable to the people. They will have to pass upon them in the last resort, and to say we will or we will not have them.

Hon. MR. PEMBERTON—The objection seems to me to be dividing British Columbia into districts. It is a qualification for Senators that they must reside in their districts, therefore I think it will not be desirable to divide the colony into districts. I think the clause should stand as it is.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—One matter deserves attention in connection with this item. I believe that the indemnity to Senators is six hundred dollars in a lump sum, without travelling expenses. I think it is now commuted, and this would place British Columbia Senators at a disadvantage with others. It is no hardship to other Provinces, but would be most unfair upon British Columbia, travelling expenses both ways should be allowed.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—My conviction is that mileage is now allowed. If I am right ten cents a mile both ways is allowed.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—It is the prerogative of the Governor; we had better vote for the repeal of the Organic Act.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—Under the proposed constitution Senators would be chosen by an irresponsible Governor, on the advice of an irresponsible Minister; those who own this country do not want such a state of things to be.

Hon. MR. WOOD—It is better to bear in mind that the Organic Act applies to three or at the most four Provinces: Canada East, Canada West and the Maritime Provinces, here we want exceptional terms.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—Hon. members seem to assume that we are going to enter Confederation without responsible government. This I repudiate. I say we shall enter with privileges equal to other Provinces. I decline to assume anything else. With regard to the appointment of Senators by the Legislative Council, I would ask by what Council? By this or by the new House? It would not satisfy the people that a Council nominated by the Governor should appoint, and it is yet to be seen that the new House, as shadowed forth by the Governor, would be less objectionable than this one. We are entirely in the dark.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—As I understand it these Senators are to be appointed after Confederation, and consequently the recommendation refers to the new Council. His Excellency says that he will give a majority to the popular members, and I have no doubt he means what he says. I believe him to be a most estimable gentleman, but I have a feeling that he has been misled; it is not likely that in a few weeks' travel he could understand the wants and feelings of the people; you must eat, drink and sleep amongst them to understand a people. If I were a great Government contractor I would support the Government. I ask some reason of rank; it would be very easy to give us a majority of two or three popular members, but unless we have a large majority of Representative members the Government might still get their own way.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I desire, Mr. Chairman, to answer two points. I believe we shall fight for and have responsible Government. In referring to the Governor's speech, the Hon. member for Lillooet, says the new Council will be just similar to this, that it will still be unrepresentative. I cannot see why there should be this doubt about the

Constitution of the new Council. If there were to be only a majority of two or three the Council would still be unrepresentative, and the people will not be contented with such a form of Government. The argument of the honourable member for Lillooet refutes itself in the most conclusive way. The people do not want an unrepresentative House, nor having their confidence to elect their Senators.

Hon. MR. RING—What have we to do with the Organic Act? Why should we put ourselves under the iron points of the Organic Act, and be dragged under a harrow all the days of our lives? If the act is wrong it must be repealed. Now is the time to express our opinion.

The Chairman put the recommendation of Mr. Humphreys, which on division was lost, and of Mr. Robson, which on division was lost.

Clause fourteen passed as read.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—Sir: I rise to move the adoption of clause fifteen, which is as follows:

15. The constitution of the Executive authority and of the Legislature of British Columbia shall, subject to the "British North America Act, 1867," continue as existing at the time of union, until altered under the authority of the said act.

And before touching upon the merits of the resolution itself I wish to explain that the time which must necessarily elapse before Confederation will allow ample opportunity to procure a change in the Constitution, and I desire to impress upon Hon. members that this question of alteration in the form of Government, is not necessarily connected with the resolution now before the House. I make these observations in consequence of observing a notice of the Hon. member for Lillooet on the subject of responsible government on the orders of the day. On behalf of the Government I desire to say that there is no desire whatever to shirk the full discussion of the question of responsible government. I throw the door open and invite the fullest discussion, but as the question of the change of the constitution of this colony is one that lies between this colony and the Imperial Government, it does not form an item in these resolutions, therefore I would ask Hon. Members to postpone the consideration of responsible government and pass these resolutions. On a question of such importance a special day, irrespective of these resolutions, should be set apart for discussion—there is no desire whatever on the part of the Government to shirk the question. The matter of the constitution is under negotiation between this colony and the Imperial Government at this moment. Supposing these resolutions are passed, other negotiations must take place. First, Canada has to accept them, then there is reference back to British Columbia to submit to the popular vote, so that there will be full time allowed for the new institutions to be inaugurated if the people say that they do not

want the terms, but that they want responsible government, they will undoubtedly get it. I cannot conceive our going into Confederation with a Crown Council—we must expect to go in with fuller representative institutions. If we do not have Confederation under these terms, we shall nevertheless have representative institutions and a majority under the Imperial Act will have the power to change and get responsible government, that is party government. My point is, that it is not necessary to drag in responsible government now; it is not necessary to mix it up with these resolutions. Our vote on this resolution need not be decided on responsible government, or party government. We shall still be open to send any other resolution on the subject of party government to the Governor. I therefore throw out the invitation to discuss it more fully on a future day. I feel sure that if this course is adopted the discussion will be more free.

Hon. MR. RING—I think, Sir, that his Excellency's message, if I may so call these resolutions, invites us to discuss responsible government. Sir, we have been in former days favored with representative institutions, and have been defrauded of them. I desire to know what we have gained by the irresponsible government that has for some years past oppressed us. What I ask has been done about the various questions that have come up—the Sisters rocks, the Court of Appeal—the answer has been, no funds. Where do the funds come from? From the people. If the Governor heard the views of the people he might, perhaps, change his views. I ask hon. members here, who have lived under responsible government in Great Britain, (Hear, hear from Mr. DeCosmos) not to be recreant to their country. Hon. members on the other side say they are against responsible government and refer to a former House of Assembly of Vancouver Island. This is no argument. I trust that hon. members loving British institutions will be true to their country, because there are defects in some assemblies do not let us run into the abject error of saying we are not fit for self government. We have borne this too long; do not let us hand over to Canada our consent to submit to this degradation; let us not say we are unfit; that we surrender the question of self government. Who, I ask, has examined the people? Who has tried them and discovered whether or not they are competent to exercise the privileges of responsible government? There are many points in this clause which demand discussion, but I am not going to exhaust myself. I say, however, that the question of responsible government must be considered. I throw the gauntlet down.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—Mr. Chairman, as mover of the resolution on responsible government, I do not think it necessary to take up the time of the House. I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that the official members are convinced that the people are in favor of responsible government. As a

student of history, young as I am, I begin to realize this truth; that all liberty and improvement has been infused into communities by the shock of revolution, or violent agitation. There is no hope of political improvement in time of tranquility and without agitation. The official members of this council are remarkable for their profound indifference to right and wrong. It is in their interest to postpone the settlement of this question of responsible government. I hold that there is a great necessity for this resolution; the question ought to be settled now and forever. Why should we be compelled, year after year, to fight these battles for reform over and over again; let this question be settled so that we may have leisure for other things. Hon. gentlemen say the people are not in favor of responsible government; time will show. I say that they will almost as a unit insist upon it, and I lay down this proposition—no responsible government, no Confederation; no Confederation, no pensions. Instead of tightening the governmental reins they should be slackened. If responsible government is not granted these officials will still lose their power; for then in all probability a mightier nation than Canada will take charge of us. I am in favor of Confederation if it gives us permanent advantages not otherwise. We must have a free constitution. My conscience tells me that my votes on these resolutions are not prompted by selfish motives; if the people get responsible government I am satisfied. His Excellency admits that he would not like to extend the liberal form of government to this colony. My opinion is that there is no community unfit to govern themselves; government is not a complicated machine; there is very little difference between carrying on a government and carrying on a business. One-half of the depression in this colony is in my opinion attributable to the despotic form of government. Just fancy the head of a mercantile house allowing his clerks to carry on the whole business of the firm as they pleased. (Hear, hear from Mr. DeCosmos). Without responsible government you will lose Confederation: it is not necessary to say anymore; let us have something like the government of Ontario. Those whom I have the honor to represent sent me here to advocate responsible government. I will read from a petition now in my hands.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—This is out of order; I rise to call the hon. member to order; this is not the time to present a petition.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—The hon. member has a right to read from it.

CHAIRMAN—The hon. member cannot read from a petition which has not been presented to and received by this House.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—Mr. Chairman, I request that you will be careful in ruling on this matter. Hon. members have the right to read from documents to show the views of their constituents. It is alluded to as the

best means of acquainting the House with the views of the constituency which the hon. member represents.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—On the other hand I would say that the right of petitioners must be respected, and if hon. members are allowed to read petitions, then petitions can be got in by a side wind.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—In my opinion the hon. member has a right to read from a document of this kind.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—Having looked at this document I see it is not a petition to this House and may therefore be quoted.

The Chairman having looked at the document decided that it might be quoted.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS then read a portion of the prayer of the petition, which purported to be to Her Majesty the Queen.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—The honourable and learned Attorney General has appealed to those honorable members who are in favour of responsible Government to postpone the question for the present. I should be glad to accede to the request if the honorable and learned gentleman will meet the objections that present themselves to my mind as to that course. In my opinion to vote for this section now will preclude the possibility of our bringing on the subject of responsible Government in the House this session. We shall be met with the assertion that it has been already discussed and decided for this session. I am quite sure the honorable and learned Attorney General does not wish to catch us in a trap.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—Certainly not. As honorable members have insisted upon opening the question, I now propose to go on with the discussion.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I am most anxious to meet the views of the Government in this matter, if possible, but as we are asked to vote aye or no upon this clause, I say that in voting for it we shall be casting our votes in direct opposition to Responsible Government.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—The discussion must go on now; you have begun; it is too late to withdraw; the lists are closed, and the gang of battle down.

MR. ROBSON—Mr. Chairman, I will address myself to the question before the House, which I feel to be the most important clause in these terms: a question, in fact, which underlies the peace, prosperity and happiness of British Columbia; a question which, if carelessly or improperly treated now, may eventuate in the most serious consequences to the Colony; for I believe the people are as ready now as in earlier days to fight for freedom, and to shed their blood in defense of their political rights. It becomes us, then, to be candid with ourselves and with each other, very serious, firm and dispassionate in discussing this clause, as it might result in most disastrous consequences. As I read the clause it places it beyond the power of the Colonists to obtain the form of Government which they, as I believe, really want, and if we pass it

we shall obtain no more than that slightly more liberal form, which is foreshadowed in his Excellency's speech, under the cover of representative Government. Profoundly impressed as I am, with the gravity of the subject we are now called upon to consider, any remarks I may be enabled to offer will proceed rather from a sense of duty to my constituents and to my country than from any hope of changing the views or influencing the vote of any honorable member. What is responsible Government? I have been led to believe that considerable confusion of Ideas exists upon this point; and I was the more impressed with this upon listening to the remarks of the honourable member for Cariboo, a few days ago. That honorable gentleman compared the introduction of responsible Government into this colony to applying the machinery of the Great Eastern to a dairy churn. Now, sir, responsible Government is not a quantity; it is a principle; and as such it is applicable to the Great Eastern or to a dairy churn, capable of being applied to a tiny lady's watch. It is a principle admirably adapted to the largest communities in the Old World. It is a principle admirably adapted to the smallest communities in the New World. It is a principle that may be worked out in a cabinet of a hundred. It is a principle which may be successfully worked out in a cabinet of three. Without it no Government can, in the true sense, be called a people's Government. All true Governments derive their power from the people. All true Governments must be responsible to the people. Responsible Government is, then, a principle which may be adapted to, and successfully worked out in this community. If this proposition is incontrovertible, which I maintain it is, who can say that British Columbia is not large enough for responsible Government. There are men here of ability to form a cabinet. The Cabinet of the day is, under the responsible system, the Government. Just so long as it has the confidence of a majority of the representatives of the people in the House. In the event of that confidence being lost, one of two courses is open. The Ministers place their resignation in the hands of the Governor, who commonly calls upon a prominent member of the opposition to form a Ministry; or if they believe that the House does not truly represent the people upon the question at issue, they advise a dissolution and an appeal to the country. What would responsible Government have to do here? In dealing with this question I, of course, assume British Columbia to be a province of the dominion; and I confess, that were it otherwise, were it proposed to remain a separate colony the case would be different. I do not say that even then I would not advocate the introduction of responsible Government, but that advocacy might be less hearty and less firm. Regarding British Columbia as a province of the dominion, the chief objections are removed by the

removal to Ottawa of all those larger and more complex questions of legislation which might threaten to crack the brain of our embryo statesmen. The local Government would alone have to deal with local questions, and thus it would have very simple duties to discharge, scarcely more difficult, in fact, than those falling within the functions of a large municipality in Canada. Are the people in British Columbia fit for it? And here I would express my sincere regret that the representative of her Majesty in this colony has felt it to be his duty to pronounce an adverse opinion. I will yield to no one, either in this House or out of it, in entertaining a high respect for his Excellency, for his talent, experience, and honesty of purpose. But I do say, and I say it with respect, more in sorrow than in anger, that I cannot think his knowledge of the people of this colony was such as to justify him in so early pronouncing upon their fitness for self-government.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—The honorable member for New Westminster will, I am sure, pardon the interruption, but I feel it my duty to deny that the Governor ever said, or that any member of the Government has said or thought that the people of British Columbia are unfit for self-government.

MR. ROBSON—I thank the honorable and learned Attorney General, and I appreciate his motives. There is no one less disposed than myself to speak or write one word calculated to weaken the hands of the Government, or cause the well-deserved popularity of his Excellency to wane; but yet I cannot conceal from myself the fact that a mere play upon words will not mend matters. Whether it is the colony or its inhabitants that has been pronounced unfit for self-government, the practical results remain the same, and it is with these we alone are concerned. From my own knowledge of the people, and it is the result of eleven years' contact with them, I have no hesitation in saying they are pre-eminently fitted for self government. There are scores of men in the country with callused palms and patched garments well fitted by natural endowments, education and practical experience in the working of responsible Government in other colonies, to occupy seats either in the Legislative Assembly or in the Cabinet of British Columbia. He who would judge of the intelligence and mental acquirements of men in this colony by outward appearance and by present occupation certainly would not judge righteous judgment. The opinion of his Excellency the Governor to the contrary, notwithstanding, I boldly assert that the people of British Columbia are fit for responsible Government. Do they want it? Doubtless there are those in this House, possibly even in the unofficial ranks, who will deny that the people of British Columbia really desire to have responsible Government under confederation. It is sometimes difficult to account for divergence of opinion; but I ven-

ture to think that I have the weight of both argument and evidence on my side when I assert, as I do, that the great body of the people, certainly an overwhelming majority, do earnestly and intelligently desire that form of government. It is difficult to believe that any man who has given due thought to the subject can possibly hesitate. Look at the position this colony would occupy under Confederation, without the full control of its own local affairs—a condition alone attainable by means of responsible government. While the other Provinces only surrender Federal questions to the central government, we would surrender ALL. While the other Provinces with which it is proposed to confederate upon equal and equitable terms retain the fullest power to manage all provincial matters, British Columbia would surrender that power—her local as well as her national affairs would virtually be managed at Ottawa. Could a union so unequal be a happy and enduring one? The compact we are about to form is FOR LIFE. Shall we take into it the germ of discord and disruption? The people desire change; but they have no desire to exchange the Imperial heel for the Canadian heel. They desire political manumission. I stand here, and, in the name of my ancestors, protest before Heaven against the surrender of constitutional rights purchased by the best blood of our race—a priceless legacy we have no right to barter away, even if we would. We owe it to our ancestors to preserve entire those rights which they have delivered to our care. We owe it to posterity not to suffer their dearest inheritance to be destroyed. But, if it were possible for us to be insensible of these sacred claims, there is yet an obligation binding upon ourselves, from which nothing can acquit us; a personal interest which we cannot surrender. To alienate even our own rights would be a crime as much more enormous than suicide, as a life of civil security and political freedom is superior to a condition of serfdom; and if life be the bounty of Heaven, we scornfully reject the noblest part of the gift if we consent to surrender that certain rule of living and those constitutional rights, without which the condition of human nature is not only miserable but contemptible. I know but too well that the people of this colony have, during these years past, been unjustly and unconstitutionally deprived of their rights; but the perpetration of a wrong in the past can constitute no argument for perpetuating that wrong in the future; and it would appear a most fitting moment, when a new constitution is about to be offered, to demand the full restoration of political rights of which we have been for some time so unjustly deprived. A word about the constitution which the Governor proposes to confer upon this colony. Regarding it in the dim light shed upon it by the Executive, it is not unfair to assume that there will be one more popular member taken into the Executive, and that the people will have a majority of two in the Legislature. Let us suppose that the Legisla-

tive Council has 20 members, 11 elected by the people and 9 appointed by the Governor. Three are taken from the 11 into the mysterious chamber of the Executive, where they become—I will not say corrupted—manipulated, educated to see things somewhat differently from what they saw them before. In a House so constituted, is it unfair, is it uncharitable to conclude that, on all government measures at least, the government would command a majority? Take 3 from 11 and 8 remain. Take 8 from 20 and how many remain to the government? Is it not 12? Where, then, is the people's majority under the proposed constitution? And yet I am constantly told that this is not the proper time to ask for responsible government—that if the people want it they will possess, under the new constitution, the ready means of obtaining it. Sir, I do not see the matter in that light. I see in the proposed constitution a condition of things which promises a five years', possibly a ten years' agitation for what the people are prepared for now, desire now, are entitled to now. All governments are naturally conservative. All persons holding positions of honor, power or emolument are conservative. Think you those holding office by appointment will favor or promote a change which would make them responsible to the people—exchange their commission from the Crown for the more brittle tenure of 'public opinion'? On the contrary, we should find those in power opposed to the people in their struggle for responsible government; and how long the struggle might last it would be idle to predict. Besides, the people of Canada do not desire to see British Columbia occupying any such false position. They know too well the value of free institutions, and their adaptation to new countries to think of withholding them from us. These institutions were not won without a long and bloody struggle, even in Canada; and the prosperity and contentment of that people date from the inauguration of responsible government. The failure of representative institutions formerly enjoyed upon this island, is frequently cited as an argument against responsible government being introduced here. I admit the partial failure of these institutions. That failure was not, however, on account of the institutions being 'representative', but because they were not 'responsible.' The essential principle was wanting. There was no constitutional connecting link—no bond of sympathy between those who sat by the will of the people and those who sat contrary to, and in defiance of, that will. The system, painted, though it was, in popular dress, was rotten at the core—proved a delusion and a sham. The people, sometimes in indifference and contempt, permitted unsuitable men to be elected, and the whole thing came to rack and ruin. It is to avoid a repetition of that unseemly farce that the people demand that any new constitution which may be conferred upon this colony shall be based upon the only true principle of responsibility. This ques-

tion should be finally settled. The colony desires political rest. To inaugurate a fresh political agitation with union is most undesirable and might lead to disastrous results. The possible consequences of a refusal to grant responsible government coincident with Confederation is a part of the subject I almost hesitate to touch. I would neither prophecy, predict nor threaten; but I would ask the government to read well and carefully the lessons written in blood in other countries. Human nature is much the same on both sides of this great continent. Has the Anglo-Saxon race become so utterly degenerate here that it is prepared to barter away for mere money subsidies those rights which were purchased with so much blood elsewhere? I utterly refuse to think so meanly of this people. We have seen that even the half-breeds at Red River have too much of the old blood in their veins to permit a fancied political wrong. I am not going to predict a rebellion here. Heaven grant there may be none. But I do feel it my duty to warn the government against unnecessarily provoking such a possible contingency. Why should there be such an unaccountable antipathy to investing the people of British Columbia with those political powers enjoyed under the British Constitution? Why is the present form of government so unpopular with the people? I will tell you why. It is just because it is not a people's government. They had no hand in making it. They have none in working it. They can have none in unmaking it. Only let the people have a hand in forming the Government, in selecting men of their own choice to rule over them, and we would find a popular government, a strong government, strong in heart and confidence of the people. The very same gentlemen who are unpopular now, because ruling without the consent of the people, would be popular then, because ruling by the act and with the consent of the people. The people of British Columbia are naturally a conservative people. Restore to them their political rights, and no Government would need to fear an undue desire for change. The people know best how to manage their own local affairs. Depend upon it; sir, the people are seldom wrong in their opinions; in their sentiments they are never mistaken. Those now in power have a great responsibility resting upon them. Upon the manner in which they acquit themselves in regard to this very question may hang the most momentous consequence. Will they promote everlasting wellbeing? or precipitate untold evil? Heaven grant that they may do right! I stand here today to advise and warn, not to threaten and predict. The Government has a very grave responsibility in this matter, and may well take a lesson from other countries. The possible consequence of a refusal to grant a reasonable request may be repetition of the Red River trouble. Let not the government make a fatal mistake, or they may find themselves in a state of political agitation that may lead to the most serious consequences. I believe that, under circumstances analagous to what oc-

curred in the Red River Territory, the Imperial Government would treat the inhabitants of this colony with even more consideration. It would not be a question of bayonets and fleets to coerce this colony; but it would be a question of what concessions ought to be made. I say that the Government have an opportunity now not only of shunning evil but of doing a great work. Oh! let not the Government make the fatal mistake of saying the people shall not manage their own affairs. Do not let them make the fatal mistake of compelling the people to reject these conditions at the polls. Now I have discharged a duty; I have said all I feel called upon to say at this stage. I have stated my own views and, I venture to think, those of an overwhelming majority of the people of British Columbia as well as of my own constituents. I trust the Government will take care how they force a vote on this question which affects this whole community (Hear, hear). This is, in a sense, distinct from the conditions, and it is probable that the Governor must obtain what we are now asking from a different quarter. But, obtain it from where he will, it **MUST**, I say, be obtained.

I beg to move the following amendment, as meeting the case more fully than the resolution offered by the hon. member for Lillooet:

Whereas no union can be either acceptable or satisfactory which does not confer upon the people of British Columbia as full control over their own local affairs as is enjoyed in the other Provinces with which it is proposed to confederate, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED.** That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, earnestly recommending that a Constitution based upon the principle of Responsible Government as existing in the Province of Ontario, may be conferred upon this colony, coincident with its admission into the Dominion of Canada.

**HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL**—Allow me to observe on this, that the hon. member is asking the Government to grant what it has no power to give.

**HON. MR. ROBSON**—The Governor has promised to seek the power to grant us a new constitution. We only ask that in that new constitution we may have responsible government.

**HON. MR. DECOSMOS**—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to occupy the House for many minutes. I agree with the hon. member for Lillooet and I disagree with the hon. member for New Westminster. I think, sir, that we ought to have representative institutions and responsible government irrespective of Confederation. The hon. member for New Westminster's proposition unites it with Confederation. I think this is a mistake, but it is of no matter so long as we get it. I look upon British Columbia as a municipal-

ity under the British Crown. Under Canada it will be a municipality with less power. Anyone who knows anything of municipal law knows that it is based upon three principles: Territory, authority and responsibility. This colony has the first two, and we are now asking for the third, and the terms sent down to the Council do not contain the elements of responsibility of the Executive to the people. Everything is tending to this point. Without responsibility, no matter how elective the new Council is, it will be a failure. The people want responsible government and representative institutions under any circumstances. I think the people would be traitors to themselves if they accepted any form of government which had not the element of responsibility. I would rebel if there were enough like me in the colony, and arrest every member of the Government that I thought was robbing me of my rights. I would go to a further extreme. However, I shall not trouble the House with a long speech on this matter, as I consider it of little use. This question ended, I am contented to leave this Council and go to my constituents.

HON. DR. CARRALL—Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask what all this breeze is about? It is perfectly clear to all that as soon as we enter the Confederacy the people of this country can have any form of government they desire. I refuse to take up the issue without Confederation, in a state of isolation. We are dealing with Confederation. I am, equally with the hon. member for New Westminster, aware of the priceless boon of responsibility, which exists in England, which may fairly be called the Standard-Bearer of nations, and I am equally aware that the same responsibility does not exist in the United States. During the late war I was in the United States' army. Stanton, the then Secretary of War, was a most unpopular man. They wanted to get rid of him, but he could not be removed. When I took the ground that responsible government was not expedient, it was not because I did not approve of the system. It is, I say, the wisest and best form of government, but it is too cumbersome for this colony. I will repeat my objections: The Council contains no men of influence, the constituencies are too remote, and the inhabitants are all engaged in bread-seeking; there are few men of independent means who would take part in responsible government and consequently the direction of public affairs would fall into the hands of men who are not fitted or qualified to govern the country, or otherwise into the hands of Victorians; neither of which I, for one, wish to see. How unfortunate it would be for Caribooites if the hon. senior member for Victoria, (Dr. Helmcken) were elected for Cariboo, I say, then that it must fall into bad hands, or into the hands of Victorians. I offer that argument as a British Columbian. The Executive Council do not care one fig what sort of government the people take. The Executive say the question is one for the people to decide. We have a

measure of responsibility now. The hon. member for New Westminster says that His Excellency will do certain things. I take his speech as it reads, and I have no doubt that a majority of the people's representatives will sit round the board; none know how great the majority will be. (Attorney General—Hear, hear.) Responsible government has never been made a distinct issue throughout the colony. [It has, Mr. DeCosmos.] The hon. member says that it has; I say it has not. It has been named with Confederation but not by itself; and until it is made a separate question my advice to the Governor will be not to grant it. The Governor has left you to choose any government you deem best. Do you think it would be better to have as permanent heads of departments two or three gentlemen who are familiar with the wants of the colony, or a moveable ministry going out on a question of repairs to Cowichan road, or something of that kind. These are amongst the things that you have to consider, and if, after due consideration, the people desire responsible government they will have it. I am here to state that his Excellency the Governor has no wish or desire to keep back responsible government, if he had any such desire is it likely that he would have reconstituted his Executive Council so as to make it elective? I apprehend that people do not consider what they are talking about when they ask for responsible government; they have not probably considered the failures that have been made in respect of responsible government; there have been some failures, as, for instance, in Jamaica and in Victoria. A class of people get into power under responsible government whom no person would like to have as rulers. There are petty interests mixed up with politics in small communities which prevent the system working so well in them, as in large countries like Great Britain where there is a healthy tone, and a vast population and consequently great questions of national importance. I maintain that after Confederation the questions connected with local affairs will be so small and so entirely connected with particular localities that a staff of permanent heads of departments will be far better for the colony than responsible government. I make this statement from conviction. I am perfectly free to take any course I like, notwithstanding I am an Executive Councillor. My position has not in any way curtailed my views. I could have advised responsible government if I had thought proper, and would have done so if I had thought it desirable for this colony. If anyone believes that the Organic Act does not allow responsible government to be obtained at any time let him move to make clause 19 specially applicable to this colony.

HON. DR. HELMCKEN—It is in the terms already, only it is not specially named.

HON. DR. CARRALL—Well, name it specially and put it in; I will support it if anyone proposes it. We know what His Excellency's intention is with regard to giving



representation in the new Council, but we do not know the measure of it. If there is an overwhelming majority for responsible government in all districts, electors will take care to send responsible government members to the next Council, if the people are determined to have this 'priceless boon,' let them send men who will say they will have it. I feel impelled to administer a soft and gentle rebuke to the hon. member for New Westminster, who has, I must confess, won my esteem by his mainly, straightforward support of these resolutions; but I must take exception to his language, it has been too emphatic—unintentionally of course—because led away by the subject. He has used inflammatory language which he had better not have uttered, language which was not exactly in accordance with what I conceive to be correct. That clause in the Governor's speech which speaks of our not being fit to govern ourselves, Governor Musgrave has never said so; if he had I should have taken it as personal insult. I say, as a British Columbian, I am capable of governing myself, and if we can individually govern ourselves it is fair to suppose that the colony, as a whole, can govern itself. If you had the whole population come-at-able altogether, so that they could be parallel like an army, and you could make them give expression to their views, and out of that get a government, it might be practicable; but instead of that, here we are with a scattered population, isolated centres separated from each other; the majority are here for the sole purpose of making money, and they don't feel that anxiety that has been represented about responsible government; they want to be governed as cheaply as possible. If I am wrong, if it turns out at the polls that even a trifling majority are in favor of responsible government, they can have it. The iron heel of Canada is all nonsense. Governor Musgrave is the man we have to deal with, and I say that responsible government is a relief to any Governor, for it comes between him and the people. Governor Musgrave says that it is his (I paraphrase) my duty with my experience to give fair and frank advice to the people; to tell them what I think is for their good. If they determine differently to my advice the fault is with them. Supposing that Governor Musgrave had put responsible Government in as a condition, and had thrust it upon the people, would not the respectable minority who are against it have said, or possibly, and as I think probably have said, His Excellency had acted unwisely. This question has been before the people; they would have been justified in jumping at the gilded bait of responsible Government if the Governor had not proposed a new system; but as he has done so the people will do well to consider before they swallow the barbed hook that lies under the bait. I desire to disclaim speaking in the interest of officials their position would, so far as I believe, not be injured in any way by the introduc-

tion of responsible Government. Those among them who were commissioned in England (I mean the heads of Departments) will be rendered so independent that they will be above fighting after their own interests. I think it unlikely that they will remain here. As to the balance of officials, if Canada is as liberal now as of old, or as liberal as Australia, they will be well provided for whether we have responsible Government or not. Probably they will be "utilized," since that is the term we are to use. I claim for the system which His Excellency has foreshadowed, that it is more suitable to the present circumstances of this colony than any other system which can be given us. Responsible Government has acted well in large communities, but in small ones I doubt its efficiency. It is like a painted ship on a painted ocean. If it were obtained in a small colony like this, there would be a constant game of battledore and shuttle cock going on—in to-day, out to-morrow. Fancy the honourable member for Victoria City presiding at the Lands and Works Department one day, and I, having paid him all the compliments I could, come over another day to have an interview with the Chief and find that there has been a change of Ministry, there is another man in. My ideas may be wrong, if so, they can be corrected at the polls. If I were a man of property, with a large stake in the colony, I should decidedly object to responsible Government. I have given my opinion candidly and honestly. I may never sit at this Council Board again. I have given my advice to his Excellency, to this Board, and to my constituents conscientiously. If I am wrong the people will correct me. I speak from conviction. No doubt there is talent in British Columbia; no doubt there is plenty of administrative ability; there are many better men than myself, I am very sure, and that is one reason that I oppose responsible Government. (Laughter.) But the main difficulty is that the best men won't come here; the chaff is blown here, the wheat remains behind.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Drake the debate was adjourned to Monday.

### Monday, 21st March, 1870.

Hon. MR. RING rose to resume the debate, and said; Mr. Chairman, I feel assured that the House will accord me leave to say a few words. There have been submitted for the consideration of this House two amendments, and in the observations of the movers two points of argument have been adduced, the first founded on supposed reasoning, and the second in the way of threats and military argument, grounded on the possibility of the government refusing to insert this condition. I desire to disengage myself from this latter argument. When I hear anything tantamount to a threat from the people against the Executive I desire to

repudiate it. Hon. members who put such a picture of warfare before us talk bunkum. I address my humble petition to His Excellency, but if his judgment is against us, I say to him stand to your point and do not give way to threats; listen to no arguments as to what may happen in the nature of threats; stand to your points. I say to Executive members, don't yield to threats, don't be moved by them. I support the principle of responsible government, but I do so constitutionally. I say to Executive members, I trust you will yield to reason and argument but not to threats. I say we can ask for responsible government without the leave of the Organic Act; but I say let us repudiate all connection with Canada until we have secured responsible government; let us not wait till we are surrounded by Canadians. With regard to the railway, I say that in the life of the youngest amongst us we shall not get it; but we must make this the main resolution: without responsible government let us have no Confederation. Better bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of. Let us not run the risk of having to ask Canada for responsible government. Make it the emphatic *SINE QUA NON* that we must have responsible government or no Confederation.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—Out of deference to the amendment offered by the hon. member for New Westminster, (Mr. Robson,) I ask the leave of the House to withdraw my motion so that the amendment, the latter part of which I like better than my own, may stand.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I regret very much that a discussion so inapposite, so totally unnecessary, should have been forced on by the other side of the House at a time so inopportune. I am glad that the hon. member for Lillooet has withdrawn his motion; it leaves the Council to deal with the amendment of the hon. member for New Westminster, and I deeply regret that the hon. gentleman did not accept the invitation to give up a special field-day to the discussion of responsible government, as suggested by myself after we had passed clause 15 of the Terms. This I stated at the time the House was quite competent to do. Then members on this side of the House might have freely joined in the discussion, perhaps some might have supported the principle, but no! The hon. proposer of the amendment, with the light of battle in his eye, had refused every suggestion; and afterwards, when he began to find out his mistake, it was too late, there was nothing for it but to go on. The *melée* had begun; the glove is down; the visors are closed, and the lists barred. It cannot be put off. If the hon. member for New Westminster had been opposed to responsible government he could not have devised a course more adapted, than mixing up the question with terms, for shelving responsible government for the session. One point which requires special notice and correction is that nearly all speakers during the debate seem to think that the

Governor alone could grant any alteration of Constitution that may be required, merely for the asking, but this is a mistake; he cannot. The Constitution can only be changed by the same power that created it—the Imperial Parliament and the Queen in Council. The Governor can only recommend. It is for the Home Government to say what the change shall be. As to the able speech of the hon. member for New Westminster, the eloquence of which I was forced to applaud in spite of myself, it was an argument based upon fallacious premises throughout, asserting that we should only have a representative majority of one, which could only lead to a false conclusion, and I take it that the hon. member is in favor of responsible government as a *SINE QUA NON*, else why all this tall talking of blood, wading knee deep in blood, why this encouragement of rebellion, in defence of our rights and the like, and yet I understood the hon. member for New Westminster to say that he does not make responsible government a *SINE QUA NON* for Confederation.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I said nothing of the kind. I do not choose to state whether or not I would make it a *SINE QUA NON*.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I have an accurate recollection, and have a note of it, and I ask the hon. member to state whether he will make it a *SINE QUA NON*.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I understood the hon. member for New Westminster to say that Confederation would not be satisfactory to the colony without responsible government, but that he would not pledge himself to make it a *SINE QUA NON*.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I said further that I did not pledge myself that the people would not.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I then understand that the honorable member for New Westminster puts it not as a *SINE QUA NON*.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—No, Mr. Chairman, I never said that. I will not be placed in such a position. I refuse to have such an issue forced upon us.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—Either the honorable member puts it one way or the other; one of two opposites must be true. I can quite understand, and must prefer the direct and simple issue of the honorable member for Victoria District, for immediate responsible Government in any case, either with or without confederation. I say, sir, that the question is in no way connected with the discussion of this clause.

I say that responsible Government ought not to be considered until after the Council is reconstituted with an increased representation, as shadowed forth in his Excellency's speech. I have said that we shall have the sole control of the matter in our own hands if we have confederation. I say we, because I identify myself with this country. I speak on this matter as a citizen. I say that if we have confederation we shall have an opportunity of getting responsible Government. If we have no Confederation then we shall have increased representation, and under

that we can get responsible Government if the country as a unit goes for it. Honorable members are complicating this question. I cannot imagine that it was the intention of the honorable member for New Westminster to complicate the question. I have too much respect for him to allow myself to suppose so; it is impossible; and that he wished to force a negative, is equally impossible. It is an error of judgment in my opinion. If it had been left to the Council separately it would have left honorable members more at liberty to consider the question freely. I was, in common with other members carried away in admiration of the outburst of oratory of the honorable member. But there was an allusion—a warning. It is said that it was not a threat; but there was talk of shouldering muskets, and of blood and bloodshed, as if that was the proper way to get civil rights. I protest against these threats, these turgid speeches which oppress the ears of those who wish to listen to argument and reason. As to the opposition of the Government members it arises from no dislike to the system on the part of the head of the Executive. Responsible Government interposes a barrier between the people and the Governor, which is most useful to the Governor. I say that we are not in a position to take advantage of responsible Government. If the country thinks it necessary or desirable what is there to prevent our getting it when we choose to ask for it. The honorable member for New Westminster himself told us that the Imperial Government were always ready to step in, and yet he hints at violence and disturbance. When the honorable Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works proposed a resolution last session, which was seconded by myself, with respect to a change in the Constitution, asking for a Council with a majority of one of representative members, honorable members said we don't want the change, and voted it down. If we had secured this we should have been a step further in advance than we are in constitutional progress. I say we must hesitate before any body constituted as this Council is, can pass resolutions of such a nature. Any such resolutions ought to express the full and deliberate opinions of the country. As to the special merits of responsible Government itself, it is hardly necessary to argue it here at such an inopportune time. I shall therefore merely say that I think it totally inapplicable at present to the circumstances of British Columbia, where population is so sparse, and lies at the circumference of a circle which contains an area of 300,000 square miles, and where representation is so difficult that the form suggested would be the most expensive that could be adopted, and instead of preventing agitation will be likely to increase it. Much of the population is alien, and in any case this Council is not the proper body to pass upon it. If, however, the country is of a different opinion they can say so at the polls, and there is no power can prevent their getting responsible Government. But I would ask what makes the system so particu-

larly attractive to honorable members who advocate it? We are told that it is solely, because it will be good for the colony, but there is no attempt to prove the proposition that has been set up. Another thing strikes me as coming with a very bad grace from those who support this recommendation. It presupposes a distrust of Canada, and assumes that men of the large experience of Canadian Statesmen, and so reliable as they are, are not to be trusted to yield to a general cry from the country for enlarged representative institutions. I don't think that this is the time to go into the question. I say, then, that whenever responsible Government is wanted it can be had. I need hardly refer to the position of official members in this matter. The terms already passed by the House so far as this question is in any way connected with Confederation, leave the officials free to express their opinions. I must, myself, vote against this recommendation, and I press upon the honorable members to do the same in order to prevent the complication of the terms with any such irrelevant question.

HON. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I must endeavor in as few words as possible to state the position of the Government members upon the subject now before the House. I fully understand that it was imperative upon some hon. members to bring forward this question of responsibility at some period of the present session, having advocated it by speech and pen as the specific remedy for the ills that the colony was laboring under. Consistency demanded that the question should be brought up by them for discussion; it was a logical necessity. Inexorable fate, I say, impelled certain hon. members to advocate responsible government. I had, however, hoped that the hon. members who advocated it would have reserved it for separate consideration, instead of bringing it up as an amendment to this clause now under consideration. (Mr. Robson—no, not an amendment.) Virtually it is an amendment. If this clause had prescribed that any future alteration in the constitution should have been dependent on Canada, then I could see the desirability of hon. members on the other side of the House taking exception to it; but as it is I confess I am at a loss to comprehend their position. Although, as I said inexorable fate compelled hon. members to bring the subject forward, it is a mistake to bring it up in a Council constituted as this is, especially when the Governor has so distinctly expressed his views in opposition to the inauguration of responsible government at the present time. It would surely have been much more to the advantage of the cause they advocate for hon. members to have postponed the consideration of the question for the more representative House shadowed forth in His Excellency's speech. I say shadowed forth, for on reflection it must be plain to all hon. members that His Excellency was not in a position to tell what the constitution of that House will be. He does not know. He has recommended

certain changes for Imperial sanction; they may or may not be favorably considered. His Excellency does, however, tell you that the representative element will be larger, and I think, therefore, that it would have been wiser on the part of the representative members who advocate responsible government to have left it to the next Council instead of bringing it forward while the present resolutions are under discussion. The subject, if not positively irrelevant, is not connected with this resolution, which simply provides, as a matter of form, power to change the constitution, in accordance with the Organic Act, when the people desire it. In common with the hon. Attorney General, I am surprised that hon. members who cordially support Confederation should be afraid to trust the Dominion Government upon this question. I am surprised at the inconsistency of those who tell you that the people could not get responsible government under Confederation, and that the wishes of the people would not be allowed to prevail. I am surprised particularly at the hon. member for New Westminster expressing any doubt upon this subject. I, as an individual member of this community, would willingly leave the interests of the colony to the guardianship of the Canadian Government. If I did not think that that Government would exercise whatever power it might have for the benefit of the people, instead of, as suggested by hon. members, for its own aggrandisement, I would have no Confederation. If under Confederation there would be no chance of responsible government, how can the hon. member expect to get it from a Council constituted as this is? However, as the subject has been brought forward for discussion, it behoves us to consider it upon its merits. There were two propositions before the House. The hon. member for Lillooet has withdrawn his, which was in reality but a vague expression of an abstract opinion in favor of responsible government, a recommendation in general terms. We have now to confine our attention to the amendment of the hon. member for New Westminster; the preamble of which states that Confederation will not be satisfactory to the people without responsible government. The resolution itself although embodying the same principle as the one which has been withdrawn, contemplates a practical step towards obtaining the object recommended, by addressing the Governor. The hon. member for New Westminster was careful to reserve his own opinion, but he was very positive that Confederation without responsible government would not be acceptable to the people. Coming now to the subject and matter of the speeches of the two hon. members, I find that the arguments of the hon. member for Lillooet are simply invectives, his entire logic is abuse of the Government and the persons composing it. I have always understood that assertion is not fact, and that invective is not argument. It may be that my inability to appreciate the force of his remarks arises from my not possessing

the qualification which he told us was essential to a proper understanding of the people and the people's affairs. It may be that I have not 'eaten and drunk and slept with the people,' and cannot, therefore, rightly estimate the strength of demonstration which general and indiscriminate abuse of government officials may convey to some minds. As to the hon. member's earnestness of belief in his case, his conscientiousness in the discharge of his duty to his constituents and to the colony, had we ever had any doubt of it, his positive and repeated assurances of the honesty of his intentions in this matter, of his unflinching determination to do his duty to those he represents, must have forced conviction upon us. But, while giving him full credit for singleness of purpose, I must take leave to remark on his singular mode of recommending the subject to the favorable consideration of this Council, since his argument in its favor is to heap general accusation and vituperation on the official members of this Council, whom he invites to join with him by voting in favor of his views, to confirm his view of their utter baseness and worthlessness. I shall not place myself in opposition to such a line of argument. But, sir, the argument of the hon. member for New Westminster is of a very different character. I congratulate him and I congratulate the House on the manner in which the matter was treated by him, and especially as regards the officials. I acknowledge the courteous manner in which he touched on these points in his arguments which affected the members at this end of the table. It is inseparable from the discussion of this question in this House that it must to some extent partake of a personal character, it must almost mean a vote of want of confidence in Government officials. The smallness of the community reduces it almost to a question amongst individuals, and as the Government members have been placed, unnecessarily and inexpediently, as I think, to some extent upon their defence, I must speak plainly on some points, but in doing so I must deprecate any idea of giving offence. I say, then, that responsible government is not desirable, and is not applicable to this colony at present, is practically unworkable. And here I would deprecate the impression which is being so studiously instilled into the people of this colony concerning what has been said of the unfitness of the colony for responsible government. His Excellency the Governor has never said, nor has any member of the Government ever said that the people are unfit, individually, to govern themselves. I say that, man for man, this community will compare favorably with any people on this coast. (Hear, hear, from the Attorney General.) Nor is it even the smallness of the population that I consider to be the great objection, although I admit that this is a drawback; but it is the scattered character of that population. It would be practically impossible to organise electoral districts so that they should properly represent the interests of the separ-

that we can get responsible Government if the country as a unit goes for it. Honorable members are complicating this question. I cannot imagine that it was the intention of the honorable member for New Westminster to complicate the question. I have too much respect for him to allow myself to suppose so; it is impossible; and that he wished to force a negative, is equally impossible. It is an error of judgment in my opinion. If it had been left to the Council separately it would have left honorable members more at liberty to consider the question freely. I was, in common with other members carried away in admiration of the outburst of oratory of the honorable member. But there was an allusion—a warning. It is said that it was not a threat; but there was talk of shouldering muskets, and of blood and bloodshed, as if that was the proper way to get civil rights. I protest against these threats, these turgid speeches which oppress the ears of those who wish to listen to argument and reason. As to the opposition of the Government members it arises from no dislike to the system on the part of the head of the Executive. Responsible Government interposes a barrier between the people and the Governor, which is most useful to the Governor. I say that we are not in a position to take advantage of responsible Government. If the country thinks it necessary or desirable what is there to prevent our getting it when we choose to ask for it. The honorable member for New Westminster himself told us that the Imperial Government were always ready to step in, and yet he hints at violence and disturbance. When the honorable Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works proposed a resolution last session, which was seconded by myself, with respect to a change in the Constitution, asking for a Council with a majority of one of representative members, honorable members said we don't want the change, and voted it down. If we had secured this we should have been a step further in advance than we are in constitutional progress. I say we must hesitate before any body constituted as this Council is, can pass resolutions of such a nature. Any such resolutions ought to express the full and deliberate opinions of the country. As to the special merits of responsible Government itself, it is hardly necessary to argue it here at such an inopportune time. I shall therefore merely say that I think it totally inapplicable at present to the circumstances of British Columbia, where population is so sparse, and lies at the circumference of a circle which contains an area of 300,000 square miles, and where representation is so difficult that the form suggested would be the most expensive that could be adopted, and instead of preventing agitation will be likely to increase it. Much of the population is alien, and in any case this Council is not the proper body to pass upon it. If, however, the country is of a different opinion they can say so at the polls, and there is no power can prevent their getting responsible Government. But I would ask what makes the system so particu-

larly attractive to honorable members who advocate it? We are told that it is solely, because it will be good for the colony, but there is no attempt to prove the proposition that has been set up. Another thing strikes me as coming with a very bad grace from those who support this recommendation. It presupposes a distrust of Canada, and assumes that men of the large experience of Canadian Statesmen, and so reliable as they are, are not to be trusted to yield to a general cry from the country for enlarged representative institutions. I don't think that this is the time to go into the question. I say, then, that whenever responsible Government is wanted it can be had. I need hardly refer to the position of official members in this matter. The terms already passed by the House so far as this question is in any way connected with Confederation, leave the officials free to express their opinions. I must, myself, vote against this recommendation, and I press upon the honorable members to do the same in order to prevent the complication of the terms with any such irrelevant question.

HON. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I must endeavor in as few words as possible to state the position of the Government members upon the subject now before the House. I fully understand that it was imperative upon some hon. members to bring forward this question of responsibility at some period of the present session, having advocated it by speech and pen as the specific remedy for the ills that the colony was laboring under. Consistency demanded that the question should be brought up by them for discussion; it was a logical necessity. Inexorable fate, I say, impelled certain hon. members to advocate responsible government. I had, however, hoped that the hon. members who advocated it would have reserved it for separate consideration, instead of bringing it up as an amendment to this clause now under consideration. (Mr. Robson—no, not an amendment.) Virtually it is an amendment. If this clause had prescribed that any future alteration in the constitution should have been dependent on Canada, then I could see the desirability of hon. members on the other side of the House taking exception to it; but as it is I confess I am at a loss to comprehend their position. Although, as I said inexorable fate compelled hon. members to bring the subject forward, it is a mistake to bring it up in a Council constituted as this is, especially when the Governor has so distinctly expressed his views in opposition to the inauguration of responsible government at the present time. It would surely have been much more to the advantage of the cause they advocate for hon. members to have postponed the consideration of the question for the more representative House shadowed forth in His Excellency's speech. I say shadowed forth, for on reflection it must be plain to all hon. members that His Excellency was not in a position to tell what the constitution of that House will be. He does not know. He has recommended

certain changes for Imperial sanction; they may or may not be favorably considered. His Excellency does, however, tell you that the representative element will be larger, and I think, therefore, that it would have been wiser on the part of the representative members who advocate responsible government to have left it to the next Council instead of bringing it forward while the present resolutions are under discussion. The subject, if not positively irrelevant, is not connected with this resolution, which simply provides, as a matter of form, power to change the constitution, in accordance with the Organic Act, when the people desire it. In common with the hon. Attorney General, I am surprised that hon. members who cordially support Confederation should be afraid to trust the Dominion Government upon this question. I am surprised at the inconsistency of those who tell you that the people could not get responsible government under Confederation, and that the wishes of the people would not be allowed to prevail. I am surprised particularly at the hon. member for New Westminster expressing any doubt upon this subject. I, as an individual member of this community, would willingly leave the interests of the colony to the guardianship of the Canadian Government. If I did not think that that Government would exercise whatever power it might have for the benefit of the people, instead of, as suggested by hon. members, for its own aggrandisement, I would have no Confederation. If under Confederation there would be no chance of responsible government, how can the hon. member expect to get it from a Council constituted as this is? However, as the subject has been brought forward for discussion, it behoves us to consider it upon its merits. There were two propositions before the House. The hon. member for Lillooet has withdrawn his, which was in reality but a vague expression of an abstract opinion in favor of responsible government, a recommendation in general terms. We have now to confine our attention to the amendment of the hon. member for New Westminster; the preamble of which states that Confederation will not be satisfactory to the people without responsible government. The resolution itself although embodying the same principle as the one which has been withdrawn, contemplates a practical step towards obtaining the object recommended, by addressing the Governor. The hon. member for New Westminster was careful to reserve his own opinion, but he was very positive that Confederation without responsible government would not be acceptable to the people. Coming now to the subject and matter of the speeches of the two hon. members, I find that the arguments of the hon. member for Lillooet are simply invectives, his entire logic is abuse of the Government and the persons composing it. I have always understood that assertion is not fact, and that invective is not argument. It may be that my inability to appreciate the force of his remarks arises from my not possessing

the qualification which he told us was essential to a proper understanding of the people and the people's affairs. It may be that I have not 'eaten and drunk and slept with the people,' and cannot, therefore, rightly estimate the strength of demonstration which general and indiscriminate abuse of government officials may convey to some minds. As to the hon. member's earnestness of belief in his case, his conscientiousness in the discharge of his duty to his constituents and to the colony, had we ever had any doubt of it, his positive and repeated assurances of the honesty of his intentions in this matter, of his unflinching determination to do his duty to those he represents, must have forced conviction upon us. But, while giving him full credit for singleness of purpose, I must take leave to remark on his singular mode of recommending the subject to the favorable consideration of this Council, since his argument in its favor is to heap general accusation and vituperation on the official members of this Council, whom he invites to join with him by voting in favor of his views, to confirm his view of their utter baseness and worthlessness. I shall not place myself in opposition to such a line of argument. But, sir, the argument of the hon. member for New Westminster is of a very different character. I congratulate him and I congratulate the House on the manner in which the matter was treated by him, and especially as regards the officials. I acknowledge the courteous manner in which he touched on these points in his arguments which affected the members at this end of the table. It is inseparable from the discussion of this question in this House that it must to some extent partake of a personal character, it must almost mean a vote of want of confidence in Government officials. The smallness of the community reduces it almost to a question amongst individuals, and as the Government members have been placed, unnecessarily and inexpediently, as I think, to some extent upon their defence, I must speak plainly on some points, but in doing so I must deprecate any idea of giving offence. I say, then, that responsible government is not desirable, and is not applicable to this colony at present, is practically unworkable. And here I would deprecate the impression which is being so studiously instilled into the people of this colony concerning what has been said of the unfitness of the colony for responsible government. His Excellency the Governor has never said, nor has any member of the Government ever said that the people are unfit, individually, to govern themselves. I say that, man for man, this community will compare favorably with any people on this coast. (Hear, hear, from the Attorney General.) Nor is it even the smallness of the population that I consider to be the great objection, although I admit that this is a drawback; but it is the scattered character of that population. It would be practically impossible to organise electoral districts so that they should properly represent the interests of the separ-

ate parts, and of the whole colony. As Victoria is the centre of wealth, and intelligence also if you will, under present circumstances the government would be centralized in the hands of Victorians, who would thus rule the colony, and this would be objectionable (Hear, hear from Mr. Holbrook), and I say also that there would be a great difficulty in getting proper representatives to represent the respective districts. I do not agree with the hon. member who has stated that only the chaff of the people is blown into this House, for I say, sir, that this Council, constituted as it is, has proved that men fit to represent the people do come here. Responsible government will come as a matter of course when the community is fit for it, but that form of government is not fitted for communities in their infancy. It has never been so considered. Look abroad into the world and you will find large populations without responsible government. There is no necessity to look far off to see whether the Anglo-Saxon race must necessarily have responsible government. Look across the Straits, where there is a population of, I suppose, 30,000 people, and there they have neither responsible government nor representative institutions. Look at Oregon, also with no representation until the population exceeded 45,000. Look at the Red River Settlement, also with a population larger than ours; they do not apply for responsible government. It does not follow according to the rule of Anglo-Saxon minds that this form of government must prevail. I do not think the sort of responsibility which is advocated would be suitable to this colony at present, or would promote its true interests. If I did think it desirable I should be found amongst its most cordial advocates, as this is a matter open for discussion without Government direction. But I think, sir, that our present form of Government is practically a more real responsibility to the people than that proposed by the hon. member for New Westminster, this form which the hon. member for Lillooet finds it so easy to animadvert upon. For we are in reality if not directly responsible to the people. We, as servants of the Crown, are directly and immediately responsible to the Governor, and the Governor is responsible to the Queen, who is the guardian of the people's rights. This is no mere idea, for the fact of responsibility has been, over and over again, proved. If you have any good grounds of complaint you know where to lay them and get redress. This responsibility which we owe is more real, less fluctuating, less open to doubtful influences, and under it the rights of the whole country are secured and protected, and not those of the majority to the prejudice of the minority, as under the so called responsible government, which really means party government, advocated so warmly by the hon. member for New Westminster. Why, sir, the hon. member has admitted to you that under that system the government of the day might come down to pass measures by unfair means.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—No, I made use of no such words; what were my words?

Hon. MR. TRUTCH—The hon. member said, and I took down his words, that under responsible government 'the government might come down to the House and carry measures by means not excessively fair.' I say that this cannot occur under the present system, that no corruption can be charged against this government. I think the House is capable of being remodelled. I would rather see a larger element of representative government in this Council with such a majority that the government would have no opportunity of passing a measure objectionable to the people, as understood by their representatives; such a majority as I advocated in a resolution submitted to this Council. But the hon. members for New Westminster, for Victoria District, and for Lillooet, tell you that the people desire responsible government, that they must have it and will have it. I say, sir, that if they do say so, which I very much doubt, it is because the population have been educated up to it by those who have agitated the subject through the Press and through speeches; some no doubt press for it from conviction, and some with a view to serving their own ends, but I believe, sir, that what the people really want is such an administration of the government as will tend to bring back prosperity to the colony. You are told that the present officials have no sympathy with the people, that they are not of the people, that they move in a different sphere, and constitute a class by themselves. Is this true—or is it not rather the fact that persons who have ends to serve have put us in a class by ourselves? The hon. member says that the hands of the benefactors of the people must be callous with labor. Who, I ask, are those throughout the world who have labored most for the people by speech and pen? I say that the great statesmen who have done most to advance the truest interests of the people, have not sprung from the ranks of those whom the hon. member classes as the people. The hon. member for New Westminster says that the present government officials are well enough, able and honest but that they cannot enjoy the confidence of the people because they are not THEIR officials, they are not elected by them. And, be as able as we might, and as honest and work as we might, and do what we might for the people's good, we could not gain their confidence because we are not directly responsible to them. And the hon. member sympathized with us for the position! Now, sir, if it be true, as he says, that the government have not the confidence of the community when, he says, they deserve it, whose is the fault? I say, sir, it is the fault of those who, by voice and pen, have for years sedulously prejudiced the public mind of this community against that government, not by pointing out faults to be remedied, but by general and indiscriminate fault finding,

descending to personal abuse, and even to the verge of scurrility. We have striven to do our duty. Hon. members do not advance arguments, but content themselves with saying that we are unpopular. I tell you why: If false impressions have gone abroad on this point let the responsibility of those impressions rest where it ought, for I say that it has been the business of certain persons to prejudice the public mind against government officials; let them settle the question of motives with their own consciences and with the people. If the officials in this House occupied the positions which would be held by officials under party government, I could understand the persistent course of opposition offered by some members present; but when I see the changed position, that there is no responsible government, and that our mouths are closed and our pens cannot be used in self-defence, I feel that we have been struck in a cowardly manner, and let the public defend the motives of those who have attacked us. I invite all in this House or out of it to aid us to carry out the government, and to act in a reasonable way in promoting the general interests of the colony. Whether we are to have responsible government or not I don't know. I feel that it will come in good time, when the circumstances of the colony are so changed as to admit of its adoption—I think sooner with Confederation than without it—but whether we have it or not, I ask hon. members to assist us instead of endeavoring to complicate matters and retard the progress of the colony. I ask them to give us some credit for good intentions. Now, sir, one remark in conclusion: the hon. member for New Westminster, in his powerful oration, has not only allured us with the prospects of popularity under responsible government, but he has, I will not say threatened, but warned us of the result of our opposing him in this matter. He tells us that unless responsible government be conceded the cause of Confederation will be ruined, that the people would not have Confederation without responsible government, this in fact is embodied in the preamble of his resolution. Sir, I have cordially supported Confederation because I honestly believe that it will be for the benefit of the local interests of this community as well as for the security and consolidation of Imperial interests; but I believe that this community is not ready for responsible government; I will not, therefore, do what I consider wrong that good may come; I will not vote for responsible government for the sake of gaining Confederation. I, for one, say, if the people won't have Confederation without responsible government, if they regard responsible government as the main object of Confederation, if they do not appreciate the real advantages of Confederation, let Confederation wait a while. The Governor has sent down resolutions which he thinks can be carried out, and we hold that, whether under Confederation or not,

this matter of responsible government will ultimately have to be settled by the vote of the people. When the proper time comes we shall, I say, as a matter of course, have responsible government, and that time will arrive sooner under Confederation than without it. I trust the Dominion Government; I do not think they will go against the will of the people. I believe that in this, as in other matters, if they exercise influence at all, it will be for the good of the country. A government of liberal institutions cannot be expected to oppose the wishes of the people in proper and reasonable matters. Responsible government ought not to be a condition of Confederation, and I say that in these resolutions it is very properly left to be settled in a new and more fully Representative Council, which the Governor has told us he is going to obtain Imperial sanction to establish. But if Confederation is to depend on this question of responsible government then I say let it be the test also of the reality of the supporters of Confederation.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I expect the privilege of a general reply, but I desire to explain, now, that the Hon. Chief Commissioner has made an unfair use of what I said about “horny hands and patched garments.” I disclaim having used it in that connection attributed to me; his remarks are unfair.

Hon. MR. WALKEM—I think on an important question of this kind every member should give a reason for his vote. I have given the matter great consideration, and had intended entering somewhat fully into the discussion, but the Hon. Chief Commissioner has anticipated me. I have been utterly astonished as I listened to what fell from him. I entirely coincide with him in his argument and in his views. Indeed, I can hardly help thinking that either he has copied my notes or I his. I must congratulate myself on coming to this conclusion. On the same grounds I congratulate the House on the good temper, good taste, intelligence and ability with which this question has been launched for discussion. The main speech for the honorable member for Victoria District did not deign to express his views, has been that of the honorable member for New Westminster. As I listened to that speech, sir, one of the best ever uttered in this House, I almost felt that for five long years I had been wrong, he almost made a convert of me, but upon looking a little more closely into it I find that it is based upon false premises; his arguments are fallacious, and his conclusions wrong. The honorable member says that responsible Government is a principle which may be applied either to the Great Eastern or to a dairy churn, or to a lady's watch; that it is a principle capable of being carried out by three, or three hundred. This is utterly incorrect; it is not a principle but a form, one element of which is responsibility to the people. It is a form adopted by the people, but it does not follow as a matter of induction that it can be used or carried out in



every place or by every community. In 1837 the rebellion in Canada for the purpose of acquiring responsible Government took place. The rebellion was raised and the question agitated simply for changing the form of Government. What was the population? It was in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 in 1837, and of 2,500,000 in 1861. Look at the difference of the population of this colony, after deducting the aliens and females, there is scarcely a voting population through the whole colony of 3,000. Have the whole country mapped out and show me how much further the Governor can go in usefully extending the representation. We have nine members, and out of these nine, under responsible Government, we should have to elect a Colonial Secretary, an Attorney General, a Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, and probably two other Cabinet Ministers, altogether five in office and four struggling for power. Make the whole number eighteen and you then have a constant struggle for power, a struggle such as we have not had in this colony before, and such as I hope we shall not see. There are virtually two ends of the colony which represent all the wealth and property of the community, Victoria and Cariboo. Cariboo would be contending for the repeal of road tolls, and Victoria would be contending that they ought to be paid. It may be said that these general questions of taxation will be left to the Dominion Government, but there are many other subjects which will create differences between the two ends of the colony. The honorable member for New Westminster says if we go in without responsible Government we shall go in with agitation. Does any one believe that if we had responsible Government to-morrow, politicians will have no subject on which to agitate. Political agitation will never cease. Let us go further. As the honorable Chief Commissioner says we have the United States advocating responsible Government, and that form of it which is said to be the best in theory, a form in reality democratic, but the people are not educated to the extent of the principle itself. Americans are averse not only to granting small but large territories, the freedom which we now ask. They say, "You shall be a Territory until you are properly educated." For instance, there is Washington Territory, with a population of 27,000, sends a Delegate to Congress, who has no vote. Dakota, another Territory has been refused admission as a state until it has a population larger than it now possesses. I am just reminded about Alaska, which is not even a territory yet. General Thomas reported against giving it any other than a military form of Government. How can we then expect responsible Government with our population. I know that there are honorable members wavering; their interests tells them to vote one way, their conscience points to another. I say, vote according to your conscience. I say that a village can never have responsible Government. I maintain that it would prove a curse through the agi-

tation that would follow instead of a blessing. I coincide with the honorable member for New Westminster as to what he says as to callous hands. I believe there are men with tattered garments in the upper country quite capable of giving a sensible vote upon all questions likely to come before a Council in this colony, but we find that they have too much to do, they have no time for politics, they have to earn their own bread. I believe that the honorable member for Cariboo has uttered the true sentiments of the great majority of the district. I do not believe that Cariboo is favorable to responsible Government. These gentlemen with the patched garments and callous hands have the same opportunity that the member for New Westminster has had of coming into the House. He has told us with pride of his hard work as a pioneer on the Fraser river, and to-day we hear him advocating with most eloquent language, his views upon this great question. His voice has had much to do with shaping the councils of this House, and I ask, are these doors shut to any man in the colony of equal talent with the honorable gentleman who can be found willing to devote their time to the service of their country? I do not feel in the servile position of being obliged to vote one way or the other. I am as free to vote as the honorable member himself. I shall give my vote to the best of my ability. I believe that no compulsion has been brought to bear upon any member of this House, official or otherwise. The latter part of the speech of the honorable gentleman (Mr. Robson) is hardly worthy of the former. It contains language which I am very sorry he has used, language which makes me believe that it is not from conviction, but that it is intended to go forth to the world to stir up the people; excellent stump oratory, if, without intending the slightest disrespect I may use the term. I believe it is not the wish of the property owners of Victoria to have responsible Government. Do you suppose, sir, that property owners are going, willingly, to intrust their interests to persons of whom they know nothing? I do not dread professional politicians, I believe they are as useful as any other professional men in their way, but I say, as a fact, there are no politicians here with the exception of those who have devoted their time to politics. Why, I ask, is there so great an antipathy to leaving this question for the people to decide at the polls? "Give us," says the other side, "an opportunity of educating ourselves, so that our mistakes, when made, may be remedied." I say that there is no better education than this Council in which honorable members have education before they come to responsible Government, for under the scheme foreshadowed by the Governor, the position will be very little inferior to responsible Government. Depend upon it, if the Canadian Government think we can manage responsible Government they will give it to us, they will be glad to get rid of the question. I say, however, this question is being agitated at an inopportune time.

I, for one would not consent to trust my interests to any such change. I do not believe in the present form of Government, but if the form foreshadowed by the Governor be carried out, it will give the people a system very little inferior, as I have said, to responsible Government, and infinitely more workable. I trust that honorable members will give due weight to the remarks of other speakers who have preceded me upon this question, and will well consider their votes.

Hon. MR. DRAKE—Mr. Chairman, I have a strong objection to this clause being inserted; it never ought to have been in the terms. It presumes that this colony is willing to go into Confederation with the form of Government that we have at present; it seems to have been put in as a sop to Canada; it ought to have been left out. I cannot see why it was inserted, or what advantage it can possibly be to us. If we go into Confederation bound hand and foot with the same form of government as now, we shall have no power to change the form. We shall then have Canada as a Queen Regnant; we shall then have an Executive who will if so directed, vote against responsible government. This colony would be a preserve for Canadian statesmen and Canadian patronage; we shall be no more advanced than now. Without going into argument I may be pardoned, I trust, if I quote three propositions of John Stuart Mill on responsible government. First, 'Do the people require it; or are they unwilling to accept it?' We are told that this has not been made a question; I deny this statement. It has been made a question, more or less, in Victoria at every election; every election depends more or less on this point. Second, 'Are the people willing to take the burdens which are imposed on them by such a form?' I say that we have the answer to this proposition in the fact of there being people willing to come here where they are practically useless. Do not persons come forward to represent the people? A very large majority of the people take part in every election. Third, 'Are the people willing and able to do that which will enable the government to perform its functions properly?' This I contend is the condition of the colony. The main argument of the Chief Commissioner in his very able speech, a broad argument and very well put is that the population is scattered. I say this argument cannot be used with effect. We are told that the Government would fall into the hands of Victoria as the centre of population and wealth; no great harm if it did. Victoria is dependent upon all parts of the colony and they on her; the interests are identical. Another objection that has been raised is that we cannot get men of proper intelligence and qualifications for positions of honour and trust. Looking round this council board we see men who have come out to this colony to make their own fortunes and homes; 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 sufficiency or insufficiency 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 except once 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 and the chaff came here.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—Sir, I have listened to the speeches of the hon. Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works and to the hon. Government Nominee, 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 answers with them. One hon. member says that it rests on numbers; I say that intelligence is the only qualification for responsible government; numbers have nothing to do with it. If I err I am proud in erring with some of the greatest men that England ever produced. The hon. Chief Commissioner has admitted 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 civil wars and troubles have not arisen from the uneducated, but from the ambition of these so called educated classes. The people have been the Conservatives who came forward to keep the country going; take away the so-called intelligent and educated classes and it will be no great loss, the laboring 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 reality. They have endured too long the law's delay and the insolence of those in office. Why should we come here, year after year, to ask for a change in the form of Government? I think that responsible government should be a *SIN 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 support 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 wanted to bring on Confederation, government of from for and by the people, without regard to the material interests of the Colony—this means government by politicians. These gentlemen will sacrifice every benefit to the Colony for responsible government. Confederation to me means terms; to them it means pickings, office, 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 AD CAPTANDUM arguments addressed to the galleries; there people can state what their opinions really are; here popularity has to be sought. We are told that the people will fight for responsible Government. That is mere nothing—words only. The honourable member for New Westminster in his able speech erected a very handsome structure, but like 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; if 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 House of Assembly, that policy frequently changes and turns round. The same thing would happen under responsible Govern-

ment. 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 fault-finding with the present government—merely the assumption that the people desire change. This 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 allow our material interests to be jeopardized by a cry for responsible government, not allow responsible government to be the sauce to make the public swallow bad and unprofitable terms. All members have acknowledged that 'money' is the basis of all governments; let us get that money. I would not have the public vote for responsible government and forget or put in the background, 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 upon it, and those who think responsible government everything will vote for that to the exclusion of any terms, 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 pledged to 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 unwillingness 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; it pays them better. I need not refer to the difficulty of getting members, and doubtless some of

us sit here from that cause, and it is no doubt true as has been said that better could 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 thirty members to carry on party government, for six weeks at least every year, or \$150 per diem for 36 days, which would amount to \$5,400 and then the mileage would come to as much more, say, altogether \$10,000. Add to these the salaries of the political heads, say five at \$2,000 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 great corruption. 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? Hon. members say that if responsible government is not granted we will agitate. I thought that everybody was so much in favor of it that the people would rise, if it were not included 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 'beat the bush' once more, 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 admit that many of the people of Victoria desire it, and think that it can be carried out. Ask the scattered districts in the country and they will tell you that they do not know or care about it, political opinion does not run high in the colony. I intend to support the government upon this clause, but I leave myself perfectly free 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 not mix up the question of responsible government with it. I am perfectly willing to abide by the decision 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 polls responsible government might carry Confederation with very different terms. I am perfectly certain that the Government have acted wisely in not allowing the terms to be clogged with responsible government. I say don't let responsible government take the place of material benefits.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—Sir—I rise to take exception to what the hon. and learned member for Victoria City said about being bound hand and foot to Canada. In my remarks he can find no efforts to catch votes, and no clap trap addressed to the galleries, but I advocate what 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 now, for 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 on.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I said that as the hon. member for New Westminster and others insisted upon opening the discussion it must go on.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I felt regret that it should be brought up now 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 New Westminster and Lillooet every opportunity for discussing the important question upon a day to be set apart for the purpose.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—What I did was in consequence of what the hon. Attorney General said at the commencement of the debate, he invited recommendations, 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, now the gauntlet is down, the debate must go on.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—Sir, this course is most unfair on the part of the government members. Let the House decide whether it will go on with this question now or postpone it. It seems to me that the hon. Attorney General is resorting to a parliamentary manœuvre in forcing this matter on. It is a matter that representative members only ought to vote on. We shall have a large majority of representative members on this question and that is all we want. I say that the Attorney General did not fairly answer my question as to whether, by passing this resolution, we should shut the door to further discussion of the question during the present session.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I should now object to the resolution being withdrawn, as the question has been discussed let us take the decision upon it, it would be unwise to postpone the question.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—I think, sir, the matter cannot now be postponed, let us fight it out and have done with it.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I say, sir, that this debate may be postponed, and if the government vote is given against the postponement we shall know the reason.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—The hon. Chief Commissioner said that he should take an adverse vote on this resolution as a vote of want of confidence. I don't want that. Won't hon. government members help us?

Hon. DR. CARRALL—The opposition say that the government ought not to have put such a resolution on the terms. Let us take that issue.

Hon. MR. BARNARD—It was not my desire to hamper the government; I desired to give a hearty support to the government, and, at the same time, to do my duty to my constituents. I have never felt the weight of responsibility as I feel it to-day: I feel that I am about casting a vote which will affect for weal or woe the destiny of this fine Province. I am convinced that if a majority of the elected members of this Council vote 'aye' to-day on this question, responsible government will be inaugurated conjointly with Confederation. It is beyond a question that the intelligent portion of the community are in favor of responsible government, but there is a grave question in regard to its adaptation to the colony. The words coming from His Excellency are worthy of careful consideration. They contain strong reasons against the introduction of responsible government. Public opinion is not settled on the Island. The hon. senior member for Victoria city has shown in his remarks that there is a great want of settled principle in the colony. The principal men of Victoria are averse to taking upon themselves the duties and labor of legislating for the country. Men of standing and wealth stand aloof. The merchants, manufacturers and professional men take no interest in the matter of legislation. There is a great difficulty in getting good representative men. There are, I admit, many good reasons which might be urged against the measure, and I have no doubt that dissatisfaction, to some extent may ensue. I agree with the Commissioner of Lands and Works, in his remarks about the press influencing the public unfavorably to the government, but the blame is not in the press but in that system of government which keeps the rulers silent. The members of the government ought to be in a position to defend themselves both by pen and speech. I have glanced at a few reasons against the admission of responsible government, but I will now look at the other side. Look at the fact of all the larger subjects, under union, being dealt with by the Federal power. This fact of itself is as strong an argument as we need. What hon. member can go to his constituents and tell

them that he thinks the local business of this colony could be managed better at Ottawa than it can be by ourselves? The official members of this government will no doubt avail themselves of the retiring pension, and appointees from Ottawa will take their places. Will these latter officials have to be pensioned off by this colony when we adopt responsible government? This is a strong objection to entering the union under a system like the present. This colony may be asked to pension another set of officials. Will the people be satisfied with this sort of government if we are to have appointees from Ottawa? There are a class of men who oppose Confederation on this ground. They would prefer remaining as they are, with the officials nominated from Downing Street, rather than from Ottawa. It is often asserted that this colony is not ready. How long are we to wait? Canada was told the same story when she had a population of 600,000. All the other Provinces were told the same thing. Must we wait for such an increase, or must we fight as did Canada? Throw us on our own resources as a colony and we will soon learn valuable lessons in the science of government. There were gentlemen of good families and of good education, who came here in early days, who had never suffered privations of any sort before they came here; sent out to make fortunes, or, at all events, homes for themselves; their roughing it was rough indeed, bad news had come from the mines, the avenues of trade were closed, there were no agricultural pursuits for them to turn to, the consequence was that they had to lie round hotels; after failing to get government employment, for which, as a matter of course, they applied, some kept bars whilst waiting for remittances. The reason was that they never had been taught self-reliance; we shall be in the same position if we are constantly to have rulers from England, or Canada, but throw us on our own resources and we shall succeed. Self-reliance is the best means of education in politics as in anything else. If our rulers are sent us from England or Ottawa we will always lack self-reliance. Self-reliance is written on every line of the "British North American Act." Rely upon yourselves, is the cry of the people of England. It is better to grapple with the difficulties now when the issues are small and comparatively unimportant, and should we make blunders they will not be so serious when our interests are small; and for what errors we do commit, the consequences will fall upon ourselves. We will, no doubt, blunder at first and there may be chaff blown here. If responsible government will bring the scum to the top, dross will go to the bottom. The scum will be ladled off—the chaff will be blown away by the breath of public opinion. The Governor's promise of a majority will not satisfy the people, and we should therefore, urge upon His Excellency to give us responsible government. I am not in favor, however, of making that condition a *SINE QUA NON* of Confederation. I would accept Confederation with good

terms, even without responsible government. There may be a few arguments against it, but there are many in its favor. Under no circumstances would I like Confederation and responsible government to go to the polls together. I hope the people will sever the two. Let us have Confederation and we shall get responsible government.

Hon. MR. WOOD—In rising to address myself to the motion now before this Committee, I do so with a double object: I feel myself challenged to uphold my opinion on the subject of responsible government as applied to this colony, and I am desirous to add a few words on the bearing of the subject in the matter of Confederation now before the Council. 1st. With respect to the subject of responsible government. As to this, sir, my views have been for a long time settled, and I shall endeavor to express them as clearly as I can; the result of them is expressed in a few words. I am in favor of the extension of representative institutions little by little, to the utmost verge of safety. But I am opposed in this community at least, to the establishment of what is called responsible government. These are my views shortly. I believe them to be the settled convictions of most moderate and experienced men not bound to flatter popular constituencies. And I believe I am doing a service to society in upholding such moderate views against the popular error and the popular bias in favor of the rash application of responsible government in such communities. I will start, sir, at once from an historical point of view. The hon. member for New Westminster has, as I understand him, asserted that responsible government is the immemorial birthright of Englishmen, and that the principle of Cabinet ministers going in and out with votes of a majority of the House of Commons is a principle of ancient date. My understanding of the history of my country leads to a different conclusion, and however much it may be clear and obvious that representative institutions are our natural and inalienable birthright—however much it may be established that the power of self taxation resides and has always resided in the representatives of the country, in the Commons of England, carrying with it the overwhelming power of the purse—it is, I believe clearly admitted that the principle of responsible government, as now understood, has existed for little more than 100 years, say from the accession of George III and the termination of Lord Bute's administration, so that I admit the hon. gentleman's proposition only so far as this. Representative institutions are the birthright of the British nations, representative institutions and the privilege of taxing ourselves. Now, sir, I believe the whole scope of representative institutions to be greatly misrepresented. It is the fashion for honorable members to say, that the Government of this or any other community are bound to govern according to the well understood wishes of the people; that the vox populi is the vox dei; that ministries and

Governments are responsible to the people. But the true principle, as we all very well know, is that Governments and ministries are responsible, not to the people as a populace, but to the representatives of the people, properly and reasonably chosen. Governments and ministries are responsible not to numerical majorities, but to the country. Now, sir, representative institutions are liable to this obvious and well known danger. I will quote the words of a well known political writer, Herbert Spencer. "Whenever the profit accruing to the Representative individually, from the passage of a mischievous measure largely exceeds his loss as a unit in the community from the operation of the injurious law, his interest becomes antagonistic to that of his constituents, and sooner or later will sway his vote." How true and how obvious this is. I might go further when the private and personal, the direct and immediate interest of the representative or of the constituents, whose advocates and delegates they are, is opposed to any matter of legislative action. This direct and material interest will, of a certainty, prevail over the distant and more remote welfare of the community, in all but very rare instances. This is the danger that threatens all representative institutions, and the only safeguard against it is the qualification—the pecuniary and material qualification of the representative, the pecuniary and material qualifications of the elector, and accordingly we see representative institutions flourishing and successful only when this safeguard practically exists. Let us turn to the example of England. In England representative institutions and responsible Government work smoothly. And why? Because of the notoriously aristocratic and plutocratic character of the Legislature of Great Britain. Political life is a sealed book to any but the wealthy classes. Every member of Parliament is a man of property, no other can afford the luxury of legislative life, and society is secure in the hands of representatives whose property would suffer from the results of vicious or reckless legislation. I say nothing of the question of peace and war, probably the most momentous and disastrous subject of vicious and reckless legislation, a question which will not arise in the colony. The cream of all legislation is taxation, and my solid conviction is that representative institutions and responsible Government will fail whenever the working majority is in the hands of an unsubstantial class of Representatives or of electors. I have thus, sir, treated of representative institutions and responsible Government somewhat in the abstract. I will now refer more particularly to its application to this colony, and this apart from any question of Confederation, and I will repeat that I am in favor of the extension to the utmost possible limits of the representative elements of this Council, but adverse to responsible Government. With respect to the constitution of the Legislative Council of British Columbia it might, I think, hardly be necessary in the

present condition of the colony, to advocate a second Chamber—a Council as distinct from an Assembly. However advisable this may be in an advanced condition of the colony, advanced in numbers and wealth, few, if any would advocate such an institution as a second Chamber. The elements for forming such a chamber are sadly wanting in the present state of affairs, and the matter may be dismissed without further comment—without discussing the advisability in a general way of such an institution at all, or the constitutional elements of such a body. But with regard to the Legislature on the supposition of its consisting of one single House, it will be necessary to speak at somewhat greater length. Of what elements ought such a legislative body to consist? At present it consists of official members, heads of departments. Official members not heads of departments but representing for the most part, different Magisterial districts, a few nominated members—nominated, I think it is reasonable to presume, from an impression of their being tolerably intelligent and moderate—and a few representative members.

It is asked whether the constitution of this Council should be altered so as to establish direct responsible government, or what may be looked upon almost as its equivalent, a large working majority of responsible members. I leave out of the question at present, all reference to any modification of the constitution of the Council in the event of Confederation, and I consider the matter at present, only in reference to the Council and the Colony in their actual condition. At present it is obvious, and must be felt by all of us, by official members no less than by independent members, that our position as a Crown Colony, is what is commonly called a FALSE POSITION. We are individually as well fitted for self-government as our brothers or our cousins in the Old Country or in Canada. I will go further: I will say that the community taken individually in this Colony is BETTER qualified to demand and have representative institutions. I say taken INDIVIDUALLY—and I mean it in its strict sense. Man for man, I believe the Colonist a better politician than his English cousin. The aristocratic class hardly exists it is true. It is an injustice to presume for a moment that the Colonist in this, or any other colony of Anglo Saxon origin is in any way unfit for the enjoyment of the freest political liberty. Higher class we have none, but the middle and lower classes are, I do not hesitate to say it, superior to the middle and lower classes at home. The colonist is more enterprising, and more pushing than the stay at home Englishman. He has better knowledge of the world and of human nature, he graduates in a school in which politics are prominent, and he is free from an immense amount of ignorance and prejudice which is thought and written and acted in the old world. But then comes the consideration, what elements are indispensable in the community to form the representative body, if as is contended, that element is

to be supreme, or what is the same thing in point of actual power, when that element constitutes the working majority? I will answer, 1. Localized and permanent population. 2. Established diversified interests; wealth, whether capital or regular income; the well-doing of professions, businesses and industries, agriculture, substantial industries, staples. Population herein we are deficient—6,500 adult white men—sporadic, scattered and temporary. How many care to vote, how many are aliens. Established interests here also are deficient; isolation our drawback; staples we have, but they are undeveloped or unlucky; gold mining is depressed; agriculture under a disadvantage and no good market; coal not much sought after and minerals a speculation; lumber unfortunate; fisheries unestablished and commerce in the way of export killed by the abolition of the free port, or inferior from the absence of a large home demand. These are all our material elements of wealth and we have them in no great abundance. Now without them what have we? A sparse community in which the only thriving interest is agriculture, and that only because supply is not equal to demand; or in other words small in numbers and importance and no wealthy class at all. Can self government be trusted to such a population? I say, emphatically no! Now I am not greatly in favor of a high qualification for representatives for members of the Council, it is sufficient for me that they represent substantial interests; but when we have unsubstantial representatives representing unsubstantial and small constituencies I can hardly understand anything more dangerous, and I might add, more ridiculous or more extravagant. That representatives should be substantial people is desirable, but that they should represent substantial interests is indispensable. If representatives are unfaithful to their trust the remedy is possible; but where the class of electors is needy and unsubstantial, it seems impossible to conceive anything more disastrous. Taxation, as before has been observed, is the cream of legislation; and taxation at the hands of unsubstantial men, or men forced to advocate the interests of unsubstantial constituencies, will be nothing but tyranny. Opinions may be divided in many other matters, the votes of a party may be split on many points; but in the hands of the masses the substantial class will be heavily and unmeasurably taxed to suit the views of those who have nothing to lose and all to gain by any contemplated movement.

Take the example of V.I., in old days, as an example of a small and a narrow community; again, the example of Victoria, in Australia, where legislation is effected by the enormous majority of the advocates of the interests of constituents elected on a low qualification, manhood suffrage. I cannot but understand that if the Government is in the hands of the representatives of the people, and a working majority of them—supreme representative Government, if not equivalent to, is, in effect, equal to respon-

sible Government. In the hands of the representatives of the people, supplies would all be voted, except conditions were exacted, favorable to the popular will. And, sir, having treated on representative and responsible Government as applied to this colony let us see its bearing on the subject of confederation, and here I follow in the footsteps of the honorable member for New Westminster; his reasoning is mine, but not his conclusion. Without responsible Government, or its equivalent, or its approximate Government by a representative majority, we have no safeguard against a Government of Canadian officials, British Columbia will be a colony of Canada, a dependency of a dependency, and Canadian interests will prevail. Dependence on England is bearable, they have no interests apart from ours, but dependence on Canada would be unbearable; their interests are different from ours. That is the conclusion that is inevitable; it is but a logical conclusion. Confederation without responsible Government or Government by a working majority of representative members, is out of the question. Such a Government cannot be had; therefore Confederation is out of the question. I have thus sir, given my opinion on a point which is sure to meet with popular disfavor, but I am proud to support the Executive when I think it is right; and I would share the responsibility of a measure which would make that Executive obnoxious to blame. I have no chronic feeling of opposition to Government. I have no objection to individuals, nor do I impute to them sordid motives, but in the matter of Confederation the Executive of this colony are in a false position; they act primarily not for the good of the colony, but for the good, or supposed good of Great Britain, and they exercise the power of Government in a matter in which the interests of the colony are mainly at stake to carry out, and effect an organic change of great importance to local interests. It is somewhat unfair for me to say I impute motive to the Executive. I only quarrel with them when they place themselves in a false position, as in the question of education, and in this as in education I say they oppose their own views to the views of the well understood wishes of all classes of the community; and here they carry through a scheme of Confederation; they start the stone, and it is hard to see how or where it will roll. I sincerely feel for their position. The colony will demand representative institutions, and they will be forced to yield them or back out of the position they have undertaken. The answer of the Executive Government to this is as given by the Hon. Attorney General. The Attorney General says that after Confederation we are bound to have what we require—responsible Government. This is taking the matter for granted. It may be attained, but with a struggle. It is impossible to doubt that the Executive of the new province will oppose representative Government or any diminution of their own rights and their own power.

He says it is inopportune and beside the question. The honorable member for Cariboo (Dr. Carrall) says: "If the people of British Columbia want responsible Government no power on earth can prevent their having it." This is but a promise for the future. The Hon. Chief Commissioner says the community is not fit for responsible Government, but the matter is to be left to the new Council. Responsible Government will assuredly come with Confederation. The honorable member for Victoria (Dr. Helmcken) says: "This is the argument of the Government. But something must counterbalance Canada, otherwise with a working majority in the House the Dominion, Government will keep things as they are when we are a province of Canada."

### Tuesday, 22nd March, 1870.

Hon. HOLBROOK—Mr. Chairman, I rise with some diffidence to give my opinion as to whether we are fitted for Responsible Government or not, after the able speeches that have been delivered by hon. members on the subject. The hon. and learned member for Victoria City (Mr. Drake), has affirmed that responsible government would give the real government of the Colony to Victoria. This I believe is true, and if such were the case what injury it would inflict on New Westminster and the Mainland generally. I feel that we are not yet fit for responsible government; but nevertheless, I think that the extent of the population is very much under estimated. It has been stated that after the most careful calculations that can be made the white population cannot be calculated at over 5,000 adults, but I think this is wrong and no doubt it has been taken from the Government accounts which do not include Kootenay, Big Bend, or the settlements around New Westminster, and I would make the adult white population to be 10,000, besides 40,000 Indians, and these Indians ought not to be ignored. If they are not represented will it not be difficult to make them contented with the change from the Imperial Government to Canada? And it is for this reason that I have given a notice of motion in this House to show them that they are not forgotten, and that they may go on with their settlements and improvements in safety. But if we are to have responsible government I will not be answerable for the consequences. We are told the question is to be submitted to the people. I say let us wait for their decision. I have confidence in Canada and am content to take my chance of being well governed by the Dominion Government, rather than try something of the working of which we know nothing. I have no doubt that great agitation on the subject of responsible government will be got up by the press and that many members will gain their elections by confusing the questions of Confederation and responsible government. I entirely concur with the hon. Mr. Wood in believing



that more liberal representation will do much more for the good of the Colony than responsible government. I believe in a good franchise being given as foreshadowed by the Governor's speech, and I think twelve elected and eight nominated members would give satisfaction and work well, although report makes the change more liberal than this. We are now on the eve of prosperity. Our Quartz mining is still to be commenced and we only want good roads to Kootenay by way of Eagle Pass, to open our resources in this respect. I do not intend to enter upon the question of responsible government. I believe it would be bad for us and is not required by the people. I shall support the Government in the clause now under discussion.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to say anything more on this subject; but on more mature reflection I am satisfied that it is my duty to do so. The more the matter is argued and the more the remarks of Government members are heard, the more I believe we are being asked to take a leap in the dark; for all I can learn is that the new House is to be partly nominative and partly elective—and not responsible; the proportions are not stated. It has also cropped out that there will be a qualification for members and also for electors. If the Government refer this matter to the people to know whether such a Constitution will suit them, I believe the people to almost a unit will reject it. The mass are opposed to Confederation altogether unless they can get a more liberal representation than that proposed by the Government. At the outset I proposed a committee of all parties to consider and report upon the whole matter; but the hasty judgment of the House, as I think, deferred the question. Now, sir, I think if the committee had met and suggested for the protection of the property element that one-third of the members of the Council should be elected for a longer period and hold property qualifications, the country would have been satisfied. I can conceive, on some such proposition as that being laid before the House, it would have been eminently successful; as it now stands it is matter of opinion. I think the Governor has been led into error if the utterances that occasionally drop from members of this House mean anything. I cannot conceive that the people will accept such a Constitution. I should prefer that we should go into Confederation as a unit. I have made these few remarks to set my mind at rest and to save myself trouble with my constituents if I should offer myself as a candidate again. I state that I believe the Government will jeopardize Confederation on this point.

Hon. MR. DEWDNEY—Sir, The question now under consideration has been so fully gone into by hon. members of this Council, that I feel it will be useless for me to take up the time of this House to any great length. At the commencement of this debate I had several arguments which I proposed to bring before your notice against respon-

sible government, but I find that these have been ably handled by other honorable gentlemen far more ably than I could have hoped to do, and should I not have been convinced at the earlier stages of this debate, other arguments have been adduced which now completely set my mind at rest on the subject. I am opposed to the recommendations of both the hon. members for New Westminster and Lillooet, particularly the latter, and in opposing them I do not feel I am injuring the cause of Confederation. But while I feel, Mr. Chairman, that it is unnecessary for me to enter into the question of responsible government, I think I should not be doing my duty were I to remain silent upon one matter connected with this debate—one upon which I consider I am as capable of giving an opinion as any hon. member of this council, namely, the feeling of the inhabitants of the mainland generally with regard to responsible government. I have travelled through this country as much as any hon. member of this council, and I have been brought in contact with all classes and have mixed with all classes, and I have yet to meet the first individual who has expressed to me his desire for responsible government. Now, Mr. Chairman, do you believe, does this council believe that the cry throughout this Colony is, down with the present form of government—let us have responsible government. Hon. members of this House are aware, I presume, that my avocations for some years past, in fact as long as I have been in the Colony, have necessarily brought me in contact with all classes, and should this have been the cry do you think I should not have heard it? I say distinctly again I have yet to meet the first individual who has expressed to me his desire for responsible government. The feeling of my constituents is not in favor of responsible government; on the contrary it was distinctly expressed to me that they do not desire any change in the present form of government. All they want is money to keep their trails in order and a resident magistrate to administer and carry out the laws. I believe that some hon. members of this House have mistaken the feelings of the country on this matter. Any dissatisfaction that exists is not with the present system of government but with the expense of carrying the system out. We all feel that, and we all know that it cannot be avoided for reasons which have been given over and over again in this house, namely, the smallness of population, scattered as it is over so vast an area. I have not heard during the debate any arguments that will prove to me or to this house that under responsible government we could have a cheaper form of government. I for one could not be convinced that we should. I believe that the public monies would be wasted, speculation and dishonesty would be the order of the day. We are told by the hon. member for Yale we must have a beginning. I am aware of that fact, and for one shall assist to put off the evil day. I prefer for a time, until our population increases, to live under the present form of

government, one under which, I am proud to say, I have lived for eleven years without seeing the faults of maladministration and other evil accusations that have been hurled at it by the hon. member for Lillooet. I am aware that that hon. gentleman was himself in some subordinate position under the government; he may of his own personal knowledge, while in that capacity, be aware of some malpractice, but I defy him to point out a single instance brought before the notice of the government that did not receive the strictest investigation and in which the individual complained of, if the charges were proved, was not discharged. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I shall take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the officers generally that have carried on the government of this Colony during the eleven years that I have lived here, and I challenge any hon. gentleman to prove by the records of Her Majesty's colonies that, in any colony or dependency of the British Crown laws have been more justly administered, life and property better protected, or the affairs of the colony carried on with greater rectitude than in the one in which we are now living. Holding these views, I must decline to support either of the recommendations before the committee.

Hon. MR. ALSTON—Sir, I am in favor of responsible government, but not the form that has been discussed in this House at so great a length. I believe all representative governments are responsible. The hon. and learned member for Victoria city has quoted John Stuart Mill. I believe, Sir, that the word responsible government does not occur in his book; he shows that the form applicable to one country will not do for another. We have heard enough in this Council to make me believe that the people do not want responsible government; I believe that a representative form of government is the only form that will suit this Colony. It has been well shown by the hon. Mr. Wood, that from the difficulty of getting districts represented, this Colony is not adapted for purely representative institutions. I think it most desirable that Executive members should have seats in this Council, and I think that a partially elective House would best represent the interests of the entire community. The American form of government is in a certain sense responsible, Executive officers being elected for a term of four years. England possesses a different form, and Canada differs again from England. The colony from which Governor Musgrave came is the last that has received responsible government; thus we may fairly trust to His Excellency to judge for us as to the probability of its working well here. The smallest colony possessing responsible government is Prince Edward's Island, and we who do not possess a population one-twelfth the size of that of Newfoundland, are asking for responsible government. The hon. and learned member for Victoria city (Mr. Drake), who seems to uphold respon-

sible government against his own convictions, admits that all power would be held in Victoria, and he says that there would be no harm in such centralization. I think, Sir, that he has read John Stuart Mill to little purpose if such be his convictions.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—Sir, I am more impressed than ever with the absolute need of responsible government. I think the hon. Chief Commissioner particularly, and the hon. member for Victoria city, have proved conclusively that two-thirds of the people representing property are determined to have responsible government. The hon. member for the city told us the people were not in favor of responsible government, and in the same sentence he tells us that if Confederation were set before the people with responsible government mixed up with it the people would take responsible government to the exclusion of material interests. I have said and say again I am in favor of Confederation, and I earnestly hope that it will be for the benefit of the colony. I sometimes think that some hon. members at the other end of the House intend to defeat Confederation. I may be called an extremist—an agitator; I admit I am. I desire to see the people having a share in the government, instead of being under a despotism, or what is equivalent to it. I have been in this Colony nearly eleven years; I am satisfied that the people want responsible government. Hon. members say there are different forms of responsible government; admitted. I am not sure that it would be advisable to introduce any one system in its entirety here. Hon. members have been quoting writers upon this subject; I will quote Lord Macauley, he says "Government, like a good coat, is fit for the body for which it is made." I say if we cannot live on responsible government, we cannot live on irresponsible government. I do not know what is shadowed forth in His Excellency's speech; I confess I cannot understand it. If the Governor had promised a two-thirds elective House, with heads of departments sitting to give information without voting, then I think the question of responsible government would never have been considered. I ask hon. members to endeavor to approximate; and if they cannot agree to full responsible government, then to give us as liberal a form as they can. If you withhold responsible government you lose Confederation.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—Mr. Chairman, in rising to reply to what has fallen from hon. gentlemen in opposition to responsible government, I crave the kind indulgence of this House; and should I, in the course of my remarks, appear unduly harsh or unkind, I beg hon. gentlemen to attribute it to earnestness in advocating a great cause, rather than to a desire to wound the feelings of any. The hon. member for Cariboo, who is also a member of the Executive, made a very convenient, yet, to my mind, singularly ineffective reply to one point in my speech of Friday. I had, or fancied I

had, with considerable force and elaborateness, pointed out the difficulties that might naturally be presumed to lie in the way of obtaining responsible government under the new constitution proposed to be conferred upon this colony; and the only answer is that the Organic Act makes the necessary provision. I was as well aware of the provision made in that Act before the hon. gentleman spoke as after; but no attempt has been made to meet the difficulties I suggested. The hon. gentleman, with that facetiousness, poetry and ready wit for which he is so justly celebrated, proceeded to point out the undesirableness of responsible government in this colony. Under it, he told us, Cabinets would be too versatile. In fact, he described the working of such institutions as a sort of dissolving views, a thimble-rigging operation, now you see it, now you don't, in such quick succession would the changes be rung. The Chief Commissioner would, it appeared from his description, be much like Lincoln's celebrated flea. Now, sir, where did the hon. gentleman acquire his experience of the working of responsible government? Was it not in Canada? What do we find to be the experience of that country? Certainly it does not in any way warrant the conclusions arrived at by my hon. friend. On the contrary, we find a change of Ministry to be of very rare occurrence. The present Premier of Canada has, with one unimportant intermission, been at the head of the government for some 12 or 14 years! As I stated on a former occasion, the people of British Columbia are not politicians; nor are they fond of change. They are naturally conservative. Give them a people's government, and in no part of Her Majesty's Colonial Empire will a less versatile, a more conservative and loyal people be found. The hon. gentleman said responsible government would blow the chaff into this House. Now, although I listened with pleasure, as I always do, to that gentleman's oratory and humor, I could not but experience a feeling of regret to find him on the wrong side of a great question; making a false step. It is sad to witness the early mistakes of a young man of such talents, ambition and promise; and when I hear such words coming from my hon. friend, I begin to fear that the bright future, the brilliant political career I had marked out for him may never be realized. Sir, a certain proportion of chaff may be blown into this House, under responsible government, as is the case now; but, depend upon it, under the form of government we seek, the chaff would quickly be blown out at the back door before the breath of public opinion. The people can always discriminate between wheat and chaff, and responsible government supplies the most effective winnowing-fan with which to separate the two. We were reminded by that hon. gentleman that responsible government had its failures as well as its successes, and he referred to Victoria, Australia, and to Jamaica, as instances of

failure. Now, I cannot but think the hon. gentleman has been singularly unfortunate in going to these colonies to prove his proposition. The former ranks amongst the most flourishing, progressive and wealthy of all Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions. Doubtless very grave political difficulties were encountered, and many mistakes characterised the earlier working of responsible government in that fine colony; but it would be most unfair to charge all these to the possession of such institutions. Nay, most of them had their origin in a different political system. As for Jamaica, hon. gentlemen must be aware that it never possessed responsible government. A mixed representative system it had; and the chief cause of failure was the absence of responsibility. It was just because those who administered the affairs of that unfortunate colony were not responsible to the people that the opposition, led by the ill-fated Gordon—a man of unquestionable ability although, perhaps, somewhat deficient in judgment—was induced finally to assume the extreme attitude which resulted so fatally. The hon. and learned Attorney General made an effort, not altogether warranted by facts, to force the advocates of responsible government into a false and disadvantageous position, in relation to the Government programme; but hon. gentlemen will recollect how anxious I was, at the beginning of this debate, to meet the views and adopt the suggestions of that hon. and learned gentleman, in respect to the particular time and mode of approaching this question. My desire to give the Government a general and strong support upon the great question of Confederation is no secret in this House; and I think I can speak with equal confidence in regard to the views and intentions of my hon. friend on my left. [The member for Yale.] But enough has already been said upon this point; and I have only to add that I utterly refuse to occupy the position in which the hon. and learned Attorney General appears desirous of placing me. That hon. gentleman was content to give the same answer to the main objection as that given all round the Government end of the table, viz, that the Organic Act provides the necessary and ready means of obtaining what we seek; and he further tells us that, inasmuch as responsible government relieves Governors of responsibility, a Governor would naturally be ready to make the concession. Such, however, is not the accustomed working of human nature. Such is not the lesson of history. The ruler hugs power as the miser does his gold, nor parts with it only as it is extorted piecemeal by the people. I am charged with having used threats—threats of blood! Now, sir, I must plead 'not guilty' to this charge. While carefully avoiding everything in the nature of threat and prediction, I asked the Government to read carefully those lessons written in blood around us, and implored them to take warning from the errors and profit by the successes of others. We were told by the hon.

and learned Attorney General that the Governor is powerless to grant what the resolution asks; but might not the same objection be raised to almost every recommendation passed in connection with Confederation? His Excellency is asking Her Majesty's Government for power to give us a new constitution. The resolution merely suggests a more liberal constitution than His Excellency proposes. There is, therefore, no weight in this objection. The hon. gentleman next tells us that the resolution implies want of confidence in the Canadian Government—that they will not listen to the cry of the people for responsible government. Now the hon. gentleman must be aware that Canada can only listen to our cry when it is heard in the particular form prescribed by the constitution. The people can only cry through the Government it is proposed to give them under the constitution foreshadowed in His Excellency's opening message; and I have already endeavored to point out the probability that the new Government might refuse to utter a cry in that direction at the desire of the people. There is no such expression of want of confidence in the resolution. The Canadian Government could not interfere—would have no power to give us responsible government until asked by our local Government to do so. Such objections I must, therefore, regard as frivolous, and utterly unworthy of the hon. and learned Attorney General. The honorable Chief Commissioner followed with his accustomed ability, but I venture to think, without his usual discretion. That honorable gentleman set out by telling us that he quite understood it to be necessary for certain members, in order to be consistent with pen and speech outside of this House, to bring forward this subject; that it was a logical necessity, inexorable fate. Now, sir, I cannot see into that honorable gentleman's heart, any more than I can into the mysterious Executive Chamber. I will not, therefore, permit myself to impute motives to that honorable gentleman in his opposition to responsible government; but he must permit me to be the best judge of those motives which have impelled me, with some degree of reluctance, to take a stand in opposition to the government upon this question. It may appear necessary, in order to be consistent with word and pen, that I should advocate in this House great principles which I have advocated elsewhere; but it may be permitted me to say that, whether here or elsewhere, I advocate responsible government under Confederation, because I conceive it not only to be the right of the people, but their interest also. We are constantly told that we should not have mixed this question up with the terms. We have not mixed it up with the terms; but the government has mixed the terms up with it; and if there is any blame, any responsibility in this connection it must rest with the government, and not with the Opposition. The honorable gentleman tells us that it is impossible to work responsible government with a popu-

lation so scattered; and in the same breath he tells us that we have responsible government now,—that the officials are responsible to the Governor, and he to the Queen. Well, certainly this is a sort of responsibility; but it is not precisely the kind we want. The responsibility now existing takes the wrong direction. It is not responsibility to the people, but to the supreme power. In this sense the most despotic form of government in the world may be termed responsible government. The members of the government of the Czar of Russia are responsible to him, and he is responsible to The Great Ruler of all; Ergo, Russia has responsible government! The honorable gentleman must see the absurdity of his very startling proposition. He next tells us that if the people desire responsible government it is because they have been educated up to it by the Press. There is more truth than argument in this. Doubtless the Press is, in this, as in other civilized countries, the great educator of the people, especially in matters political. Have not the people of England been similarly educated up to every great political reform? Such constitutes a legitimate and important function of the Press. But the honorable gentleman goes further and tells us that if the present government is unpopular with the people the responsibility rests with the Press which has, by misrepresentation, created prejudice in the public mind. This proposition I beg most unqualifiedly to deny. The honorable gentleman has confounded cause and effect. The Press has opposed the government because it is unpopular; and the government is unpopular because it is not a people's government—because it does not possess the principle of responsibility to the people. It must be remembered that the Press subsists on popular favor; and in order to subsist it must oppose an unpopular form of government. The Press of this colony has acted rather as the exponent than the moulder and leader of public opinion in its opposition to the present form of government. As I have repeatedly said, it is not the officials that are unpopular, so much as the system under which they administer. No officials can be popular under such a system. It places them in a false position. The Press is, therefore, not to blame; it is the faithful exponent of public opinion. The honorable gentleman on my left [Mr. Holbrook] dissents from this view. It is the habit of some gentlemen to affect to sneer at the Press of this colony. They admit that the Press of England is all I claim for it; but they allude sneeringly to the Press of this colony. Now, I am free to admit that the leading journal of this colony would lose by a comparison with the leading journal of England. It is smaller, and, perhaps, less ability is displayed in its editorial columns. But would not such a comparison be unfair? Apply this rule to the other institutions of the colony, and what would be the result? Taking the Press of this colony with all its imperfections, and I boldly assert that it will

compare favorably with that of any other country of like age and population. That is the way to institute the comparison; and it is the only true way. When I hear honorable gentlemen indulging in sneers at the Press I invariably arrive at one conclusion; and I will not tell you what that conclusion is. It will not be necessary for me to again allude to the improper use made of what I said about the horny-handed class, especially as the hon. Mr. Walkem fully vindicated me. One more point and I have done with the hon. the Chief Commissioner. That gentleman repeated the now stereotyped argument that the Dominion Government, being based on liberal institutions, would not withhold responsible government, if desired by the people of British Columbia. That argument has been so often met that I was surprised to hear it repeated by that honorable gentleman. Need I say, for the twentieth time, that it is not the prerogative of the Canadian Government to give, unless asked by our local government, and that our local government will, from its organic nature, be averse to asking anything of the kind? Surely I am entitled to regard the constant iteration of those exploded arguments as evidence of the weakness of the government cause. Passing to the speech of the honorable Mr. Walkem, my task is an easy one; for although that honorable gentleman spoke with his accustomed eloquence and agreeableness of word and manner, all must have felt that his effort had about it an air of special pleading in a bad cause. The principal objection that gentleman brought against the position I took on Friday was that responsible government is not a principle, but a form. Now I think it may be regarded as either or both, and I am not disposed to quarrel about mere words. What I contend for is responsible government. That honorable gentleman tells us that Canada did not get responsible government till her population reached about two millions. Now, while that gentleman is greatly astray in his figures, I cannot discover in his facts any evidence in support of the proposition he wishes to establish. They may prove that responsible government was long wrongfully withheld from British Columbia. I now come to my honorable friend the senior member for Victoria city. That honorable gentleman started out by telling us that he intended to support the government scheme, and to support it strongly; but he added that he would not say much about responsible government. Would that he had adhered to the latter resolution. It was but natural that, feeling himself on the wrong side of a great principle, he should be disposed to say little. But, unfortunately for himself he said much, a great deal too much. He said some things which it would have been much better to have left unsaid. He told us that government for, by and from the people means government for, by and with the politicians. But he does not stop there. He tells this House that the advocates of responsible government will be willing to surrender all the other conditions, in

order to obtain that form of government as a means of securing office, power, pickings! Now, sir, let us look at the political history and position of the honorable gentleman who presumes with so much boldness to judge of other people's motives. I recollect when, some two years ago, that honorable gentleman was the most ardent of all Confederationists, when he desired to rush into an unconditional and blind union, when he urged the then Governor to negotiate union by telegraph. At that time I was doubtful about the policy of IMMEDIATE union, regarding such a step as somewhat premature and unreal, so long as the immense intervening territory remained an unorganized and unopen waste. Holding these views, I proposed to strike the word 'immediate' out of the resolution which had been moved by the honorable Mr. DeCosmos; but so enthusiastic, so fanatical was the honorable the senior member for Victoria City that he longed for a stronger word than 'immediate.' Subsequently we saw that honorable gentleman the most ultra, the most rabid Anti-Confederate. We saw him opposing it in every way, both in the House and out of it, denouncing Canada as a most undesirable connection. Now, what do we see? We see the Anti-Confederate Lion rampant suddenly metamorphosed into the Canadian Lamb passant, with his longing eyes fixed on Ottawa! Such has been the magic influence of the mysterious Executive Chamber. I do not, for one, regret the transformation; but I do object to that gentleman turning round so suddenly and denouncing the motives by which others are actuated. Does not that honorable gentleman live in a 'glass house' in that sense which peculiarly disentitles him to throw stones? Is not he guilty of measuring other people's corn in his own bushel? Did not he cast all this political principles(!) to the winds and bolt in at the very first opening to place and power that presented itself? And who knows but there may be at this moment a mission to Ottawa dangling temptingly before his eager eyes? Is this the man who is entitled to turn round and, looking down from his pinnacle of temporary power, judge others? Strutting his hour of brief authority, he taunts us with seeking responsible government as a stepping-stone to power and pickings. I hurl back, with scorn and contempt, the accusation in his teeth! To pass, however, to the so-called arguments put forward by that honorable gentleman, he tells us that the resolution asks for a government like that of Ontario,—that we should require 40 or 50 members. Now, sir, it is difficult to give him credit for sincerity, as every honorable member must see that the resolution asks nothing of the kind. It asks for a constitution based upon the principle of responsible government as existing in Ontario. That honorable gentleman has attempted to make me inconsistent with myself in saying that we shall be under the heel of Canada without responsible government, and that Canada desires we should have such institutions.

Now, I see nothing inconsistent in this. Canada does desire that the people of British Columbia should possess as full powers of managing their own local affairs as the people of the other Provinces possess; but Canada will have no power to grant these institutions until asked to do so in a constitutional way through and by our local government; and the weight of my objection lies in the reasonable belief that, however desirous the people may be, the local government will be naturally averse to a change calculated to lessen its power, and weaken the tenure by which its members hold office. Again, we are told that the Governor would not be disposed to withhold institutions which would relieve him of responsibility. However plausible this proposition may appear in theory, it is scarcely borne out by experience. As I have already stated in reply to the honorable and learned Attorney General, history presents rulers in a different light. We are asked what measures of importance have been introduced that have not been introduced by the government? By this the honorable gentleman wishes, I presume, to convey the idea that the government so fully meets the wants of the people as to leave nothing for representative members to do. In what singular contrast is this with his utterances during past sessions. Here again we have the kindly bleating of the docile Confederation Lamb instead of the terrific roar of the anti-confederate lion of the past. Verily, the mysterious influence of the Executive Chamber must be potent. The honorable gentleman tells us that if we couple the question of responsible Government with the conditions of union, the people will be willing to accept poorer terms in their eagerness to obtain it. Surely, if language means anything, this is an inadvertent admission of what the honorable gentleman has been so stoutly denying, viz: that the people desire responsible Government. Leaving the honorable gentleman to the lashings of his own conscience and to the seductive influences of the mysterious Executive Chamber, we next come to deal with the Hon. the Registrar of Titles. The Hon. Mr. Alston announces himself in favor of responsible Government, but not that kind that would make the heads of Departments go in and out. He holds all representative Government to be responsible Government. The honorable gentleman may be entitled to hold a theory peculiarly his own; but it is scarcely the fitting time to announce personal theories. We are now dealing with the question of responsible Government, as understood by political economists, not as understood by the honorable gentleman who has just propounded a political paradox. He has been reading J. S. Mill and he tells us that writer never mentions responsible Government. I have not read Mill's theory, but I have read enough to know that he goes even farther than I am prepared to go in the direction of responsibility. We have next the honorable gentleman for Kootenay, telling this House that with all his experience

in the colony he never heard a man express a desire for responsible Government, and that his own constituents were distinctly opposed to it. Now, so far as that honorable gentleman's constituents are concerned, I am prepared to think that his opportunities of learning their views upon that or any other subject have scarcely been such as to entitle him to express a very positive opinion; but when he tells this House that in all his experience in this colony he has never heard a desire for responsible Government expressed, I can only say that I am surprised. The honorable gentleman cannot but know, if he has not turned a deaf ear to politics altogether, that the question of responsible Government has been a prominent issue at more than one election, and that it has been used as one of the chief reasons for Confederation from one end of the colony to the other. But, sir, I fear I have already wearied the House. Permit me to say, however, that throughout this protracted debate the efforts from the Government side of the House have been characterized by a want of argument and by a sort of special pleading, a begging of the question almost painful to listen to. Every effort has been made to raise false issues and to misconstrue remarks coming from this side of the House, and a most unfair attempt has been made to place the whole question in a false and disadvantageous position; yet, this is scarcely surprising. It was not to be expected that the unrepresentative members would approve the measure. I feel, however, quite indifferent about their votes. We have a large majority of the representative members with us, and their vote must virtually carry the measure. The great proposition I desire to impress upon honorable members is this: The colony is about to become a province of the Dominion of Canada. No union can be equitable and just which does not give this colony equal political power—equal control over their own local affairs with that possessed by the people of the provinces with which it is proposed to unite. I care not how good the other conditions may be, if the people of British Columbia are placed in a false political position they will not be content, and the inauguration of such a union will only prove the beginning of new political discontent and agitation. Mistakes will doubtless result from the first workings of responsible Government, but these mistakes were better made now than years hence, when the consequences might be more serious. The period of lisping, stammering infancy must be passed. Surely, it is better to pass it now, while the political questions are few and simple and the interests comparatively small, than to wait for great development. Almost every speaker on the Government side has accused me of want of confidence in the Dominion Government. I have no want of confidence in that Government. I know the men who compose it too well for that. I know them as honorable, liberal, large minded statesmen. But it is our local Government under the new Constitution proposed in terms so

vague in his Excellency's opening message that I doubt. The Canadian Government will possess no Constitutional power to grant us political relief until asked to do so by our local Government; and it is the hesitation, the disinclination of the local government to move in that direction which I dread. I would again warn the Government against endangering the whole scheme by having it submitted to the people unaccompanied by "Responsible Government."

Hon. DR. CARRALL—Sir: On Friday last the honorable member for New Westminster spoke at some length upon this subject, and I replied as best I could, and it is in accordance with the eternal fitness of things that I would make a very few remarks. It is one of those happy things in nature that where the poison is there is the antidote always near. (Laughter.) I propose to give the antidote. I laid down two principles: First, that the Government did not believe that responsible government as it is maintained in England was applicable to this colony. I hold to that. I maintain that no one has controverted this proposition; no one has proved that it could be adapted to the requirements of this Colony, there has been burning eloquence and all that sort of thing, but no proof. But I say, sir, that even now there is a measure of responsibility in this Government. I am responsible to my constituents, and if there is such an overwhelming force in favor of responsible government can I ever return here. The utmost that the honorable member for New Westminster has proved is, that under confederation it would take a great deal of time and much agitation to get responsible government, a minimum of five years, a maximum of ten years, and that as it would take that time it was better that we should have it at once. I say if one proposition is correct the other must be incorrect. If there is such an overwhelming desire on the part of the people for it, they will get it. If the majority even are in favor of responsible Government there is no constitutional power to prevent their getting it. There is no desire on the part of the Government to withhold it. I say it is the want of responsibility of the Executive that has rendered them unpopular, but the people have never been asked to contrast the present form of government with that shadowed out by his Excellency, and I say that heads of Departments under that system will be to a certain extent responsible. The present system is bad, but the officers are good. I say that the requirements of the colony will be met by the system proposed by his Excellency. If it is not, then let the people say so, and get responsible government. The honorable member for New Westminster allows that it is only a question of time under the Organic Act. If it should take five years, then my point that there is not such a strong desire for it is proved. I say, and I say again, that in Jamaica they could not work responsible government or even representative institutions, and in Victoria it remains to this day

a monument of stupidity and mismanagement. With regard to the assertion of the honorable member for New Westminster, I say that if speaking and voting from conviction are false steps and a bar to advancement in political life, then I don't want to advance a step further in that direction. I say that responsible government has not been made a distinct issue in elections. The government of the people was to be one of the consequences of confederation; I hope we shall get a people's government before it. The present Executive Council is one-third unofficial; the work they have done has brought a shapeless, formless phantom into one harmonious whole, and they propose to precede confederation with a form of government which will enable the people to decide what form of government they will have. I coincide with the Hon. Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, that it was not necessary to introduce this subject into the Confederation Resolution. I am sorry that it was brought up at all in connection with our scheme.

Hon. MR. HELMCKEN—Sir: I wish to say in reply to the remarks of the honorable member for New Westminster, that I support the government from conviction. I do not shirk my responsibility. I said that the one great thing that the supporters of responsible government are afraid of is that it shall be set alongside of representative government. Honorable members may find when the resolutions return from Canada that I have still something to say upon them.

The recommendation of Hon. Mr. Humphreys was put by the Chair and on division was lost.

The recommendation of Hon. Mr. Robson was put by the Chair and on division was lost.

Clause fifteen then passed as read.

The Hon. Attorney General introduced clause sixteen:

16. The provisions in "The British North American Act, 1867," shall (except those parts thereof which are in terms made or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to and only affect one and not the whole of the provinces now comprising the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this resolution) be applicable to British Columbia in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the other provinces of the Dominion, and as if the Colony of British Columbia had been one of the provinces originally united by the said act.

Hon. MR. HELMCKEN and Hon. MR. DRAKE objected to this clause on the ground that its passing would kill the notices already on the paper.

The Hon. Attorney General gave an assurance that the resolutions of which notice had been given should be discharged, and the opposition was withdrawn.

Clause sixteen passed as read.

With reference to defences:—

A That it shall be an understanding with the Dominion, that their influence will be used to the fullest extent to procure the continued maintenance of the Naval Station at Esquimalt.

B Encouragement to be given to develop the efficiency and organization of the Volunteer force in British Columbia.

On clause A being read by the Chairman, Hon. Mr. Holbrook objected to Esquimalt being named on the ground that it was only fair to New Westminster that one gunboat should be stationed there.

HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I should have been very sorry to have this clause inserted if I thought it would give us only two or three gunboats.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY (Mr. Hankin)—Because the Naval Station is at Esquimalt, it does not follow that every ship will remain there. The commanding officer can send ships where he pleases.

Clause A passed as read.

Hon. Mr. Humphreys asked what "encouragement" meant in clause B.

HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL—At present there is no means of ascertaining what encouragement can be given; I suppose arms and money.

Clause B passed as read.

HON. MR. DECOSMOS—Mr. Chairman, I gave notice of my intention to bring up a clause with regard to provision being made to protect the agricultural produce of this colony. It has been said by the hon. Executive member for Victoria City that this differential tariff is quite a new thing to me. If he will take the trouble to refer to the COLONIST of the 15th May, 1868, he will find that in article written by myself, I touched on this matter; it is not new to me. I am thoroughly persuaded that the District which I represent will be a unit against Confederation without a provision to keep up protection. From Comox to Sooke the opinion on this point is as that of one man, and I believe I may say that it is the same thing as regards the whole of the agricultural districts on the Mainland, from Soda Creek to Kamloops. I hold with respect to protection that when farmers shall be able to produce farm produce in sufficient quantity to enable them to reduce their prices as low as the prices obtained by the farmers of Oregon and Washington Territory, then protection is not essential, for this great and sufficient reason that if we can produce as good an article at home as we can get abroad, which we can put down at the same price, the cost of transport will be a sufficient protection. Our farmers will have a natural protection. With regard to manufactures, I am one of those who believe that our manufactures ought to be protected. If we go into public works we must have wagons and machinery, and the wagon-builders should have protection; then again, farming implements should be made in the colony,

and encouragement should be given to the manufacturer of these things. Again, there are the bootmaker and tailor, and the soap maker and others, even the brewer, for whom we require protection. I ask from the Executive the insertion of this principle: "That British Columbia shall be entitled to levy and collect any tax or taxes on the sales of foreign produce and manufactures entered for home consumption, equal in amount to the duties of Customs now levied and collected on the same under the 'Customs Ordinance, 1867,' provided, always, that British Columbia shall not be entitled to levy and collect any such tax or taxes as aforesaid, if the duties of Customs of Canada extended and applied to British Columbia at the time of and after union, on such foreign produce and manufactures shall be as high as the duties of Customs now levied and collected on the same under the 'Customs Ordinance, 1867,' and provided, always, that such foreign produce and manufactures shall be construed to mean no more and none other than such foreign produce and manufactures as may enter into competition with the produce and manufactures of British Columbia." I don't care how it is put in, our manufactures would come into competition with goods from Canada. That is a natural evil which we cannot avoid. There will be other advantages arising out of Confederation which will counterbalance this.

HON. DR. HELMCKEN—I have nothing to do with the hon. gentleman's newspaper articles. I can only say that differential duties are contrary to the views of Her Majesty's Government.

HON. MR. DRAKE—The hon. member's explanation is different from the clause itself. I suppose from the explanation that it is intended to apply to all foreign produce and manufactures imported. I think it will be better that I should move my motion as an amendment to his, so as to confine the protection to agricultural produce.

HON. MR. DECOSMOS—I don't expect any resolution of mine to pass. If it should pass I shall be quite surprised; but as I hold this to be the very keystone, and of more consequence than responsible government, I deem it my duty to bring it forward. But to continue the protection to agricultural produce will not reach the issue. It would not touch our rude manufactures.

HON. DR. HELMCKEN—This is left an open question by the Government, I wish it to be distinctly understood that this question of the agriculture of the country is an open question. I think I shall be found on the side of these hon. gentlemen. I think with the hon. member for Victoria District that this is the most important question comprised in these resolutions. If the terms do not contain a clause giving protection to agricultural interests, I will answer for it there will be no Confederation.

HON. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I would ask the hon. member to define how far this is left an open question?



Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I mean that every member of the Government is free to vote as he pleases upon this question of encouragement to the agricultural interests of the Colony.

Hon. MR. WOOD—Then it is free for official members to vote these recommendations?

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—Certainly it is, and it is right that it should be so; for I consider, Sir, that we have come to a most important question, one that concerns our own country. Confederation must not come like an eclipse, it must not produce a darkness and then leave us to recover. I say that if these terms are left to pass as they are and return from Canada, and are passed by the people, they will produce great ills. I say that the agricultural interests are most important; when we come to manufacturing interests it is different, they have made but little progress. Manufacturers will meet with competition from Canada and the Dominion would not stand it; we cannot have protection for manufactures, but with regard to farm produce it is different. I say that the farmers could not exist without protection; you will depopulate the country by bringing Confederation without protection. I have stated that this Colony affords more inducement to people to settle than any other colony I know of, yet we do not raise sufficient stock for ourselves. Look at the statistics, \$111,447 is the value of agricultural produce—barley, flour, malt, wheat and oats—imported. Of barley there is nearly one million pounds imported, and this would take about 450 acres to grow in; of malt about 4,500 bushels, which would require ninety acres to grow in; of flour and wheat about 87,050 bushels, which would require about 2,500 acres to grow in; of oats about 2,364 bushels, which would require about sixty acres to grow in; altogether about 3,080 acres. More land must be in cultivation to produce the quantity of cereals which I have enumerated as being imported annually, and this number of acres, supposing a man to cultivate fifty acres, would give employment to 123 men; so that 123 men will save the colony \$111,477, or \$900 each, besides growing what they want for their own consumption. In relation to this it must be recollected that mills would be at work to grind, machinery would be required, and labor of other kinds would be required, such, for instance, as brewers. In addition to this comes in pigs, there were 568 of these animals imported last year, less by 28 than in the preceding year. This is an improvement, when we consider that the amount of bacon and ham imported is 61,740 pounds less than last year. To make this bacon about 500 hogs are required; so you will see that nearly the whole amount of bacon is made by and from foreign hogs. Take butter—82,000 pounds or forty tons were imported last year. It will take 400 more cows yielding 200 pounds each per annum to produce this amount, and it would save the colony \$31,538 per annum. One

thousand seven hundred head of beef cattle would save annually \$96,949, but it presupposes 6,800 more cows at least. Now then to supply ourselves with beef and mutton, and cheese, 3,000 more cows are required; but it takes four years to produce beef. We import 7,000 sheep. Surely, no one will tell us that we have no room for 7,000 sheep or 3,000 cows. Why, it only means 20,000 acres, or thirty-six miles of land; six miles will supply the cereals, thirty-six miles in all. Why the flats at the Fraser would yield it all. The cattle business certainly requires capital, but the capital will produce great results, and recollect the good it would do the country, the amount of labor employed and land cultivated for the purpose; wool hides and bones for house use or export. What I wish to impress upon you, sir, is the profit that might be derived from the introduction of a couple hundred families. What an immense loss the colony would sustain if this were thrown open to the Americans. What a magnificent field for immigration, particularly when we consider how much more of agriculture produce will be required when public works are carried on. The market is good now; how much better it would be then. I think it would be doing those farmers who had commenced farming under a protective tariff, a great injustice to withdraw protection from them now. We must have an agricultural population. If Confederation comes and brings the Canadian tariff we destroy the agricultural interests altogether and the country will become a wilderness. Confederation without these terms will not, in my opinion, be accepted. Leave them out and Confederation will most assuredly fail. Farmers in the upper country have a natural protection from the difficulty of transport. The day will come, and pretty quickly, when they will raise more there than they have a market for. They must find an outlet, which must be where the consumers are. If the duty is not maintained how can they send their produce down. If the railway should be built, the cost of transporting goods from the interior will be diminished, and farmers of the Upper Country will then find the tariff of more consequence to them than to the people of the lower country. I say Confederation will not go down without protection. The agricultural interest will prefer living in comfort with protection and without Confederation than in a perpetual struggle for livelihood under Confederation. I am in favor of protecting our farming interests, but if we had a lower scale upon some other goods, I should think it an advantage. I support protection to the agricultural interest, and the throwing open of our ports to other things. The latter part is, I fear, not an open question.

Hon. COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Hamley)—It is difficult to tell which resolution the hon. member is speaking in favor of. It is quite true that protection may be too little on some things and too much on others; for instance, I consider the duty on

horses too high. I will tell hon. gentlemen that a revision of the tariff was considered last year by a committee appointed by the late governor, and a majority of that committee, who were all businessmen, reported in favor of lowering the duties on agricultural produce, and there was a special report in favor of making Victoria almost a free port.

Hon. MR. DE COSMOS—That was the bogus Council, I suppose.

Hon. MR. HAMLEY—They were a committee of gentlemen whom the late Governor thought fit to appoint. I think the tariff must be altered to suit this colony, but I believe it must be left to the Canadian Parliament to alter. What will our representative members do sitting in the Canadian Parliament, except they look after our interests? There is no obstacle that I know of to there being a different tariff to suit the interests of this or any particular Province of the Dominion.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—There is no reason that there should be a similar tariff all over, but I think it must be altered by the Canadian Parliament.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—I do not think that it is necessary that one tariff should prevail all over the Dominion.

Hon. MR. HAMLEY—Not at all, not at all.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—But there can be no differential duties; that is forbidden by English statutes.

Hon. MR. HAMLEY—No; not by statute; by instructions.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—So far from leaving it to the Canadian Parliament, I say we must go in with it altered. How absurd for eight members to attempt to revise the tariff of British Columbia in the Dominion Parliament.

Hon. MR. TRUTCH—I don't see it.

Hon. MR. HAMLEY—Nor do I.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—Why, look how ridiculous it is to come to this House to propose any alteration in the tariff. How much more so in the Dominion Parliament, where so many would be on the other side. If at all, it must be done by ourselves. The Canadian Government must agree to it before we go into Confederation. The other interests are subsidiary to it.

On motion of hon. Mr. Ring, the debate was adjourned to Wednesday the 23rd.

### Wednesday, 23rd March, 1870.

Hon. MR. WOOD rose to resume the debate on Tariff and said: Mr. Chairman—In speaking to the motions now before the House, it will hardly be necessary for me to say that I think that this question of Tariff the most important of all that have been introduced during this debate; my object is, as I have said, to reduce to the utmost, in the event of Confederation with Canada, the chance of difference with the Dominion, my objection to Confederation being that, however much it may apparently and at first

tend to confer upon the colony material benefits—yet there is every fear of consequent reaction and disaffection. In dealing with the matter it will be necessary to see whether the subject of Tariff now before us will have the effect of raising a direct question and difference between this colony and Canada. Tariff is not simply a mode of collecting taxes, it is a system with a double object. The object of obtaining revenue, and in the obtaining of that revenue, the further object of promoting domestic and home industries by a just discrimination between the subject matter on which taxation is levied. The question of Tariff directly tends to promote or depress domestic productions, and domestic trade; consequently the chances of difference and reaction depend on whether our interests are identical with those of Canada, or whether there is a conflict. The intended future Dominion of Canada is obviously divided so far as this question is concerned into two parts, that which is to the east and that which is to the west of the Rocky Mountains, the Atlantic and Pacific portions of that Dominion, and to these several divisions there appertain distinct and several industrial interests; agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial. Let us run through in our own minds, our own, the Pacific interests, so to say, the interests in fact of this present colony. First we have the agricultural interests; this is a material interest, as I trust it always will be considered in every colony—it is an industry which a government cannot well avoid materially to assist. I don't say "protect" but "assist," and this whether agricultural produce be a staple of the colony or not. I may here remark that I use the word "staple" in what I understand to be received acceptance of the word—produce, exportable produce, raised in a colony with advantage and at a remunerative rate to the producer, and capable of being exchanged with advantage for the produce of other countries in the markets of the world. Our next material interests are our own staples, properly so-called as above defined, such for instance as the wool of Australia, gold anywhere, or fisheries, as in Newfoundland. Our particular staples are our fisheries, our forests and our minerals to say nothing of certain aptitudes for ship-building and the repairing of ships. Next, we must take trade and commerce, our local and geographical position being such as to give us some advantage in the distribution of goods, and as such is to be regarded as an element of wealth, and one of our material interests. Let us now turn to Canada; Canada has manufacturers, but not by way of staples, because she cannot under sell the old world in manufactured goods, but with a population of, I suppose, over three millions she can produce sufficient manufactures of certain descriptions for her own use. Then her staples are agriculture, produce, lumber and a certain amount of minerals, and perhaps horns and tallow. Agricultural produce