

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 thirty-six 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 favour 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 indifferent 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 honourable 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.