

certainly would not do so. He would not so change his opinions, and he felt it an insult to be asked to do so in any shape.

Mr. RANDELL, in a temperate and argumentative speech, defended the Address in Reply as it stood, and the policy foreshadowed in the Vice-Regal Speech.

After some remarks from Mr. MARMION, Mr. CROWTHER, and Mr. W. BURGES,

The ACTING COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. A. O'Grady Lefroy) said he had no intention of trespassing on the time of the House at that advanced hour, but he would endeavour, in the course of a few remarks, to bring the Council back to the real question before the House. He concurred in the general expression of regret that the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Wellington had been made the means of introducing discussion upon the abstract question of Responsible Government. It appeared to him that the present was not the proper, nor was it an opportune, time for discussing the merits or demerits of the Constitution. The framers of the Address in Reply, in introducing the paragraph to which the hon. member for Wellington had taken objection, had no intention whatever that it should have elicited anything in the shape of discussion. Nothing could have been farther from the minds of the framers, and he regretted that hon. members had not accepted it in the same spirit in which it had been inserted. It had been represented in the course of the debate that the framers of the reply had acted injudiciously in alluding in any way to the despatch of the Secretary of State; but he could not agree with that view of the matter, and for this reason:—the very first paragraph in the Vice-Regal Speech contained an intimation that His Excellency had forwarded to the Secretary of State the resolutions adopted by the Council last session relative to the proposed introduction of Responsible Government, and His Excellency in his Speech had acquainted the House with the result. Would it have been courteous on the part of the Council, would it have been courteous either towards the Governor or towards the Secretary of State to have passed over that paragraph in silence? The corresponding paragraph in the reply had been guardedly worded, so that no hon. member in the House should, in agreeing to it, have stultified himself, or rendered himself liable to be accused of inconsistency in any way. Let the House not be carried away with the idea that it had been introduced with any view of putting an end to any further consideration of the question of constitutional change hereafter. No such thing. It merely referred to the

immediate present, and in no way precluded future action in the matter. (Hear, hear). Standing before the House as he did, this session, for the first time, he deprecated the idea that a spirit of antagonism must necessarily exist between the two branches of the Legislature. (Hear, hear). He did not recognise party feeling in that House. There were no conflicting interests or party combinations to divide the Council in a spirit of antagonism. He believed that that assembly was actuated by one common feeling,—a desire to work together for one national object—the progress of the colony. He believed that, on the one hand, the representatives of the people were disposed to work together,—so far as they could conscientiously do so,—with the Government, in the interests of the country; and he assured the House that the Government were prepared to meet them in a spirit of conciliation, in the belief that a good understanding between the two branches of the Legislature, founded upon an ardent desire to work well together in the interests of the colony, and a mutual tendency to equitable compromise where difference of opinion should arise, were the only principles upon which the present form of Government could be made to succeed. (Hear, hear). With this explanation, he trusted that hon. members on either side of the House would agree without further objection to the Address in Reply, and agree to it in its integrity.

Mr. MONGER supported the amendment, and pointed out some of the abuses attendant upon the existing form of Government. If there was nothing in the paragraph to which objection had been taken precluding the House from consistently taking any further steps towards obtaining Responsible Government, why was there so much objection offered to its being modified in the way proposed in the amendment?

Amendment put, upon which a division was called for, the result being as follows:—

Ayes10

Noes 9

Majority for 1

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Crowther	The Hon. H. H. Hocking
Mr. Gale	The Hon. M. Fraser
Mr. Padbury	Mr. Shenton
Mr. Marmion	Mr. Burt
Mr. Monger	Mr. W. Burges
Mr. Pearce	Mr. Glyde
Mr. T. Burges	Mr. Brown
Mr. Hamersley	Mr. Randell
Mr. Bickley	The Hon. A. O'Grady
Mr. Steere (Teller.)	Lefroy (Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Address, as amended, agreed to.

The Council adjourned at 10.15 p.m.