

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 favourably 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 behooves 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 favour 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 any doubt of it, his positive and repeated assurances of the honesty of his intentions in this matter, of his unfaltering 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 favourable consideration of this Council, since his argument in its favour is to heap general accusation and vituperation on the Official Members of this Council, whom he invites to join with him by voting in favour 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