

General Government that you should be appointed for life. If so, then let the people say whether such power should be conferred. Take the means to make sure that the members of the Assembly shall appeal to the country. In New Brunswick the question was about to be submitted to the people through a general election. To be sure, it was said that the term of Parliament there had expired; but if the Ministers in New Brunswick had understood they could force a vote, as was about to be done in Canada, he doubted whether the general election would have taken place immediately. He believed, too, that the Conference generally had regarded this as the most proper mode. Then he did not think that such a change should have been brought about under a Coalition Government. This was contrary to British usage, and he believed that if a petition was numerously signed, and forwarded to the Imperial Government, representing that this important change had been brought about by a coalition, the act would be declared unconstitutional. The scheme was practically unknown to the people. Under some pressure it had been sent confidentially to the members, but what did the country understand of it?—little or nothing. It had been said that if the scheme were not adopted now it would be in danger; but would it not keep good for a little while? Was it feared that the people would find out that it would occasion increased expense, and so refuse to have it? If only for the reason that it was not known to the people, he would vote against it. When the details came to be discussed, he believed some of them would not be approved; and he also thought that the project did not embrace all the provisions which it should embrace. Finally, he thought the Government should not set its face against some changes in the scheme, were it only in the matter of the election of members to the Legislative Council, and he hoped the House would lead them to consent to that alteration. When the resolutions came up, he would make it his duty to speak more positively to the particulars in question. The honorable member then sat down, saying he approved of the mode of discussion proposed. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE then moved that the debate be adjourned until Monday, which was carried.

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

FRIDAY, *February 3, 1865.*

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said the Speaker having desired that he should not go on with the Address about the union of the colonies, he proposed not to take it up till Monday next, but as the matter was one of the utmost importance, he thought it would be well now to settle the mode of conducting the discussion. He would propose that after the discussion commenced, it should continue day after day, and that for the purpose of greater regularity the Speaker should remain in the chair. At the same time he would propose that the rule which prevented members speaking more than once when the Speaker was in the chair should be suspended, in order that every member might have the same liberty of free discussion as he would have in Committee of the Whole.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD said the Attorney General's proposition that discussion should continue day after day, was one which, in his opinion, ought not to be entertained by the House. This was a very grave question, and he thought the people of this country had a right to consider maturely the sentiments promulgated by their representatives with regard to it. He was sorry, therefore, to have heard it announced by the Attorney General that the Government were to hurry the measure through, to the exclusion of all other matters.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said he had not stated this. His idea was that after the debate commenced it should go on each day after half-past seven, leaving the afternoon sitting for other business. If the discussion was to be confined to government days, the debate of Tuesday would be forgotten by Friday, the same arguments would be gone over, and they would sit the whole year round to finish it.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD said other changes of no less importance than this, with reference to Clergy Reserves, Legislative Council, Seigneurial Tenure, &c., had been before the people for a quarter of a century, and fully discussed session after session before being finally disposed of. Public opinion in that way was fully matured on these questions, but here they were called on at a few days' notice to change entirely the Constitution we lived under, and time was not to be allowed for public opinion to be expressed on it. He objected also to the suspension of the rules of Parliament, so as to make the discussion take