

I desire to say that I am anxious to have the further consideration of the scheme in this House postponed for other reasons than those which I have given expression to. My honorable friend the gallant Knight, in his remarks last evening, made allusion to the burning of the Parliament buildings. I agree with him that that was a thing sincerely to be regretted. But he stated that, if the conservatives in the Legislative Council had had the prudence and good sense to exercise the amount of wisdom that they might have exercised, they would have put off the Rebellion Losses Bill another year, which course of proceeding would, in all probability, have prevented the deplorable occurrence to which he referred. Now, honorable gentlemen, I stand here to ask you to take the advice the honorable and gallant Knight has given, and apply it to the present scheme. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) You do not know what disastrous consequences may ensue, if this huge scheme is carried out without an appeal to the people in a constitutional manner. I do sincerely hope you will allow that powerful argument for delay adduced by the honorable and gallant Knight to bear upon this question. (Hear, hear.) This is a revolution, gentlemen, not a mere payment of a few thousand pounds, that is proposed. A revolution may be carried out by the exercise of political power, as well as by physical force. If the Government of the country is subverted, it makes no difference how it is done. It is a revolution all the same, no matter how it is brought about. The effect is the same upon the country. The proposal is to sweep our present Constitution away, and supply its place with another, which may be better or a great deal worse. As I see by the clock I have only five minutes left before six, and do not desire to speak at any greater length, I will have to draw my remarks to a close. (Cries of "go on," "go on.") Well, as honorable gentlemen seem to desire it, I will make a few further remarks after dinner.

A message was here received from the Assembly, after which the House took a recess until 8 P.M. That hour having arrived, and the House having re-assembled—

Hon. Mr. DICKSON said—The great reason for delay I conceive to be that it is proposed by the adoption of the resolutions of the Government to wipe out the present Constitution of the country without consulting the people affected thereby. I have not yet heard one single observation from the Government, or from any honorable member of this House, tending to show that there is any necessity for

the unseemly haste with which the matter is being pressed. I think it ought to be laid over until after the next general election; and I beg honorable gentlemen to observe that I make no suggestion respecting a dissolution of the other branch of the Legislature. But if there is really any necessity for haste, then there is a constitutional mode of hastening an appeal open to the Government. My honorable friend opposite argued that the prerogative of the Crown was taken away, in reference to the appointment of members of this House, without an appeal to the people, and that therefore no harm could result from taking away the boon then given them without any demand on their part or any appeal to them. Gentlemen, we were then experimentalists, and the experiment succeeded well. Then why not stick to it? We improved on the Constitution on that occasion. And you may give the people privileges they do not ask, very safely. But what is now proposed to be done? It is proposed to take that power from them without consulting them, and I hold that such a thing ought not to be done. Having raised them to the highest state of political exaltation, without their even asking for it, it is now proposed to reduce them, almost without notice, to the lowest possible position of political degradation. It is the main principle of the Government under which we live, that the people, through their representatives, shall be consulted as to the composition of their Government. As for a mutual understanding between the electors and the elected, in relation to this scheme, there is none whatever, and I have thus urged delay because I do not think there is any need of hurry. There is a constitutional mode of ascertaining the views of the people, and it ought to be made use of. But honorable gentlemen say, "Oh, don't throw out any hint about bringing on a general election before the proper period; we have had elections enough during the past five years." Why, honorable gentlemen, what is proposed to be done by the passing of these resolutions? Will their adoption not bring on a new election inside of eighteen months? There is another observation I desire to make with reference to honorable gentlemen endeavoring to obtain the views of their constituents by knocking at their doors, and asking whether they favor the first resolution and the second, and so on, through the entire list. I do not think that even by such a proceeding you could arrive at a thorough understanding of the views of your constituents. The common way of doing it is for a