

sentative 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 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 favour 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 Vancouver Island 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 Responsible Government. In the hands of the representatives of the people, supplies would all be voted, except conditions were exacted, favourable to the popular will. And, Sir, having treated on representative and Responsible Governments as applied to this Colony, let us see its bearing on the subject of Confederation; and here I follow in the footsteps of the Hon. Member for New Westminster; his reasoning is mine, but not his conclusions. 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