

would vote against the first resolution, and let the others pass. Some honorable members who voted for Mr. Bagnall's resolutions might change their minds, but the vote had gone forth nevertheless.

Mr. CARPENTER supported the motion. It would not be wise to hand the province over to the tender mercies of such an unscrupulous Government as that at present in office.

Mr. LUSK said he did not vote on the previous day, because he did not agree with the resolution of the honorable member (Mr. Bagnall), although there was a good deal in it which coincided with his views. There could be no argument against the fullest discussion of the main question.

Mr. BOYLAN said the question was, would Sir George Grey go down to Wellington hampered by such a resolution as that passed on the previous day, in spite of the opinion of the constituencies, who would be unanimous in their reprobation of the resolution which had been passed? He trusted the Council would allow the motion to be rescinded. It was true it would have been flashed through the wires shortly after it was passed, but the next day the manner in which it was passed would be known, and then there would be re-action.

Mr. READER WOOD said it was true the Council could not suffer by rescinding the resolution. The only question was, had there been sufficient reasons given for such an unusual course. In his opinion such reasons had not been given. There was not one simple reason why the course proposed should not be pursued. There was nothing in the resolution of Mr. Bagnall which would hamper the Superintendent. Hon. members said that it was not right to hamper the Superintendent by passing such a resolution, and yet if Mr. Sheehan's motion were carried, they would come down with three other motions, which would hamper the Superintendent still more. If those gentlemen would say they would withdraw the three resolutions, and that in their opinion it was advisable that the Council should express no judgment on the subject at all, he would vote for rescinding Mr. Bagnall's resolutions, and let them stand where they were. They could not adopt a wiser course. There was not a man in the Province who had given any attention to the subject who did not agree with Mr. Bagnall's resolution. From Auckland to Otago Provincialism had broken down, and was disgusting the people, causing irritation, and ought to be removed. With regard to Mr. Bagnall's resolution, every one would agree that the present form of dual Government was unsatisfactory, and also that a better one should be provided. It was a most harmless resolution, and it did not much matter whether it passed or not. Mr. Bagnall did not even ask that it should be forwarded to the Superintendent. He would ask, was Sir George Grey an advocate for the system that was going on now? A great deal had been said about hampering his Honor, but had it ever occurred to honorable members to think whether they could fetter him? They tried the other day to do so, in the matter of the Police, but failed. He (Mr. Wood), had known Sir George Grey for many years, and served him in different capacities, and right or wrong, good, bad, or indifferent, he would always act and think for himself. When Sir George asked him (Mr. Wood) to take the office of Provincial Treasurer, he told his Honor that probably the Council would like to know what his views were with regard to the question of what was called ministerial responsibility in provincial affairs. He said, "Well, Wood, if the Council think that I am in this way going to act as a constitutional Governor acts, who does nothing without the advice of his ministers, I had better go back again to Kawau."

Mr. REES said the Council had no right and no power to pass such a resolution as that of Mr. Bagnall. Those honorable members who voted for it had no business in the Council. The resolution would not have the slightest efficacy, but if it would not hamper Sir George Grey, it would injure the Province. It was only fair, at any rate, that what should go forth as the deliberate opinion of the Council should be fully and fairly debated.

Sir ROBERT DOUGLAS said his views had been thoroughly expressed by Mr. Wood, and he only rose to say, with regard to a remark by Mr. Rees, that his constituents were opposed to Provincialism.

Mr. BAGNALL was surprised that the resolutions should have caused so much excitement. Those whose fault it was that the division had taken place so unexpectedly, should accept the position.

Mr. HUNT moved the previous question, in order to curtail discussion.

Mr. REES would like to know the effect of the previous question.

The SPEAKER said all honorable members who had already spoken could do so again, but no amendment could be moved.

Mr. DARGAVILLE thought it was a pity that the honorable member had moved the previous question. It burked discussion. He himself had intended to move an amendment.

Mr. SHEEHAN said the "scouts" of the other side had come in with the news that the resolution was likely to be rescinded, and honorable members thought to improve their position by moving an amendment. It was a mistake to say that his resolutions would hamper Sir George Grey more than those of Mr. Bagnall, because they were taken from his own mouth, and could not fetter him in his opinions at all.

Mr. CARLETON: It would prevent him changing them.

Mr. SHEEHAN said that if honorable members were so sure that the people were in favour of a change, why should they be afraid of letting the people decide? With all due deference to his honorable colleague, he had the authority of Sir George Grey for saying that he regarded the action taken on the previous day as most disastrous, and fettered him to such a degree that it became a question whether it was worth while carrying on any further. Sir George Grey said he had left his retirement for the purpose of taking up this question. The people heard him, he proclaimed openly what views he held; resolutions of confidence were passed in him; the provincial Press teemed with articles of approval, and yet the Council, which he expected to assist and aid him in this matter, appeared determined to convert him into nothing more or less than a mouthpiece. He appealed to honorable members not to spoil the chance the province had of getting a fair consideration of its claims on the General Assembly.

Mr. MAY was in favour of total abolition and the localization of the land revenue. He would support the Superintendent with regard to the latter point. But to say that the Auckland members must necessarily follow the Superintendent was absurd. The resolutions of Mr. Bagnall would be taken in Wellington as the opinion of the Council. The Superintendent could, of course, express his own views as member for City West.