

words. What I contend for is Responsible Government. That honourable 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 Canada. I now come to my honourable friend the senior member for Victoria City. That honourable 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 has 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 honourable gentleman who presumes, with so much boldness, to judge of other people's motives. I recollect when, some two years ago, that honourable 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 Honourable Mr. DeCosmos; but so enthusiastic, so fanatical, was the honourable the senior member for Victoria City that he longed for a stronger word than 'immediate.' Subsequently we saw that honourable 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 honourable 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 his 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 honourable 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 honourable 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 honourable 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 that 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 honourable and learned Attorney-General, history presents rulers in a different light. We are asked