

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 Hon. 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. Mr. 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 permanent. I have found, from my experience of the old Vancouver House of Assembly, that policy frequently changes and turns round. The same thing would happen under Responsible Government. If I wished to oppose Confederation, I believe that I could not do a better thing towards effecting my object than to vote for Responsible Government; but I want to see the more material wants advanced by Confederation. I know that material interests were not the pivot, but that is 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 to 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