

to have taken that interest which any Government with a right sense of its own duties would have been very glad to take. But I have some information as to what the object of the Dominion Government is in allowing that territory to remain in that condition, what the object is in aggravating the dispute. The first Minister disclosed his object—he made public proclamation of his object—he did not conceal what his purpose was. He told the House, and we do not find the statement repudiated, in answering objections that were made to the turning of the territory over, as far as they had the power, to Manitoba, that the effect of settling the boundary, that is, as settled by that Act, the bringing of that boundary up to our western boundary would compel the present Government of Ontario to be reasonable. (Hear, hear.) What did he mean by reasonable? To give up our rights; he did not pretend to make any other meaning. I now say we have a reason why he takes this course. The reason why he gives this territory to Manitoba is to compel Ontario to give up part of her rights. I do not know what he means by being reasonable except that—(applause)—and to compel us not to insist upon a boundary that he said, cannot be insisted upon in any Court in the world. The statement was made that we would come to terms quickly, when we found that we must do so. Well, it is for the people of Ontario to say whether they will yield or not. (Cheers.) I have no doubt that there is an impression on the part of the Dominion authorities, and perhaps in some of the other Provinces, if there is that jealousy, that the people of Ontario are indifferent in this matter. They seem to suppose that the people of Ontario were asleep with regard to the importance of having their rights recognized. If they have been asleep, I venture to say that they are aroused now—(Applause)—and that they will be asleep no more, and that they will not rest until every mile of a territory is surrendered to us—(Renewed cheer)—and our constitutional freedom and our special rights are both respected and secured, ever. (Loud and long-continued cheering.)

Mr. PARDEE said he desired to make a few remarks with regard to a charge of misrepresentation that had been made against him by the *Mail* newspaper, and reiterated by the leader of the Opposition, with reference to a quotation which he (Mr. Pardee) had made from a report of Mr. Blake's upon the question of disallowance.

Mr. MEREDITH—I made no charge of misrepresentation. What I did say was that the argument which the hon. gentleman used as supporting his contention was one which Mr. Blake put forward only to refute.

Mr. PARDEE said the alleged misrepresentation had occurred in the course of a speech which he had had the honour to make, and in which he had referred to the disallowance of the Rivers and Streams Bill. It would be recollected he had been contending that the Dominion Government had no right to disallow bills that were within the competence of this Legislature to pass, not that the Dominion Government had not the constitutional right to disallow measures which exceeded its jurisdiction. He thought he had the assent of both sides of the House that this was his contention. (Hear, hear.) A portion of Mr. Blake's report was copied into the *Mail* of Thursday, the 19th inst., and it was that part of the report that he was charged with having made an improper reference to. The report of Mr. Blake was in answer to a despatch of the Earl of Carnarvon, who had taken the ground that disallowance of Provincial legislation should be by the Governor-General alone, without the advice or responsibility of his Ministers. Mr. Blake contended against this proposition, and maintained that disallowance should be by the Governor-General upon the advice and responsibility of his Ministers, and in support of his argument made this statement: "It is suggested that if a Canadian Minister had the power of controlling the enactment or operation of Provincial Acts, the consequence would be a virtual repeal of the section of the British North America Act, giving the exclusive right of legislation in certain matters to Provincial Legislatures." He (Mr. Pardee) had said that he agreed with Mr. Blake in that, and not only in that but in every other portion of his report. (Cheers.) He reiterated now that constitutional disallowance by the Dominion Government would not be a repeal of the section of the British North America Act referred to or any section of it. (Cheers.) The *Mail* had attempted to prove—and had made use of very strong language in doing so—that the view of Mr. Blake on this question when in power was contrary to that taken by the present Ontario Government. Mr. Blake had not taken a contrary view. (Applause.) So far from this being the case, the report of Mr. Blake was entirely in accordance with their opinion, and was not at all open to the construction put upon it by the *Mail*. He contended that it was the *Mail* and not himself that had been guilty of misrepresentation. That paper had quoted only such portions of the report and made such comments thereon as would leave the impression upon the mind of the reader that Mr. Blake had taken the ground that the Dominion Government had the right to disallow Provincial measures whether it was within the competency of the Legislature to pass them or not. (Applause.) He would ask who was the garbler now? Was it he (Mr. Pardee) who agreed with Mr. Blake in the part of the report that had been quoted as well as in every other part, or the *Mail*, which attempted to create in the minds of its readers a false impression. (Cheers.) When a leading newspaper, an organ of a great party, undertook to base an argument upon a document such as Mr. Blake's report, and to quote from it, it was bound in honour to give a sufficient portion to show the true tenor of it, and not to leave a false impression upon the mind of the reader. But such tactics as those which had been used were only intended to hide the weakness of the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite and their organ. When they found themselves unable to meet the constitutional arguments brought forward by gentlemen on this side of the House they resorted to the practice of "calling names." They had done this in the case of his friend the hon. Provincial Secretary, who had promptly and successfully refuted the charges that had been made against him. But hon. gentlemen opposite could not evade the issue in this way. They had to go to the country upon the merits of these two great questions—the Boundary Award and the disallowance of the Streams Bill. His

hon. friend the leader of the Opposition had stated with regard to the former question that he thought the people of this Province would not take a narrow view of it. He (Mr. Pardee) ventured to say they would not, but that they would take a view sufficiently broad to take in the whole of the territory. (Applause.) His hon. friend pretended that he was willing to go to the country upon these questions. He would have an opportunity of doing so, and he (Mr. Pardee) had no doubt he would find the verdict of the people to be that they would not consent to surrender their rights in the way in which his hon. friend desired they should. (Cheers.)

Mr. MEREDITH said that the charge of misrepresenting the remarks of Mr. Blake had not been disproved. Mr. Blake did argue that the Dominion Government could interfere in special cases with Acts of the Provincial Legislature, even in cases where these Acts were within the exclusive authority of the Legislature. (No, no.) He thought when hon. gentlemen opposite declared that the Dominion Act of last session took away Ontario's territory, that the leader of the Government as an honest politician—and he believed him in most cases to be honest—should have risen and contradicted that statement on the strength of the words of the Hon. R. W. Scott in the Senate regarding the Act. He said:—"It is not pretended in the Act to say where the western boundary of Ontario or the eastern boundary of Manitoba is any further than to say that the eastern boundary of Manitoba shall come down to the western boundary of Ontario." (Applause.) The hon. the leader of the Government had made, he said, a very violent speech, threatening to take forcible possession of the territory in question, and the hon. the Commissioner of Public Works had said that they should expel intruders.

Mr. FRASER—"Intruders"—yes.

Mr. MEREDITH charged the Government with attempting to mislead the House in regard to the illegality of titles in the disputed territory, knowing at the same time that an agreement with the Dominion Government had been made whereby both Governments agreed to confirm the titles when the boundaries were finally settled. (Cheers.) The proposition of the Ministers to keep possession of the territory and to expel intruders by force he characterized as treasonable and false to the oaths of their office. And this for the purpose of inciting political feeling and with the express intention of provoking hostilities with the Dominion authorities for the miserable purpose of assisting their party in the next general elections. The people of Ontario would, he thought, trust them to defend the territorial rights of the Province, and he was willing to accept the full responsibility of the position he assumed. Hon. gentlemen opposite would not be able to shirk the consequences of their utterances.

Mr. FRASER—Oh dear, no.

Mr. MEREDITH concluded by saying that hon. gentlemen opposite would remain just where they were—(Ministerial cheers)—responsible to the people. (Cheers.)

A vote was then taken on the amendment to the amendment proposed by Mr. Sinclair the previous day, with the following result:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Appleby, Awrey, Badgerow, Ballantyne, Baskerville, Baxter, Bishop, Blezard, Bonfield, Caldwell, Cascaden, Chisholm, Crooks, Deroche, Dryden, Ferris, Field, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Graham, Hagar, Harcourt, Hardy, Hawley, Hay, Hunter, Laidlaw, Livingston, Lyon, McCraney, McKim, McLaughlin, McMahon, Mack, Miller, Mowat, Murray, Nairn, Neelon, Pardee, Peck, Robinson (Cardwell), Robinson (Kent), Robertson (Halton), Sinclair, Snider, Striker, Waters, Watterworth, Welis, Widdifield, Wood, Young—54.

NAYS.—Messrs. Baker, Baskerville, Bell, Boulter, Brereton, Broder, Creighton, French, Gilly, Kerr, Lauder, Lees, Long, Macmaster, Madill, Meredith, Merriek, Metcalfe, Monk, Morgan, Morris, Near, Richardson, Robertson (Hastings), Tooley, White—26.

The amendment was declared lost on the division.

The third paragraph of the Address was read. On the fourth paragraph, respecting the disallowance of the Streams Act.

Mr. MORRIS said he proposed to move an amendment. It was the duty, he remarked, of the Minister of Justice to examine every Act passed by a Provincial Legislature and pass his judgment upon them. The Act in question was, he declared, of an extraordinary character and interfered with the rights of property. He moved the following amendment:—"That we represent to His Honour that the Act of last session for protecting the public interest in streams, rivers, and creeks was contrary to constitutional rule and in violation of rights in private property and of natural justice, and the same having been disallowed in the exercise of the power of disallowance which, under the B. N. A. Act, is vested in the Governor-General of Canada, acting under the advice of His Excellency's Ministers, who are responsible to the Parliament and people of Canada for the action of the Governor-General in the exercise or the abstaining from the exercise of such power, while we are prepared to assert and defend our constitutional rights in regard to all matters of Provincial jurisdiction as defined in the B. N. A. Act, we do not regard the disallowance of the Act in question as an invasion of those rights." (Applause.)

Mr. HARCOURT apprehended that the two chief subjects under discussion were the most important ever discussed in any Province for many years. (Hear, hear.) They concerned the rights of the people in this Province and the broad principle of Provincial sovereignty. It was important also in that the result of that debate would be the establishment of a precedent which must either broaden or contract the rights of that Chamber. It was also important because the principle underlying that discussion concerned Confederation itself. He considered that the only logical conclusion of hon. gentlemen opposite was to strike a deadly blow at Confederation. He was not at all surprised at the result of the debate; to see the two great parties drawing lines clearly and sharply on these questions. Knowing the history of the two parties, he would have been surprised had any other result ensued. It had been ever thus when the prerogatives of the people were under discussion. During the last few days they found those on his side of the House, true to their