

glorious past, standing up for the rights of the people with an enthusiasm begotten of the occasion. (Cheers.) They found them insisting that the rights of this Province shall not be encroached upon by anyone, either at Ottawa or elsewhere. They were found taking the ground that there was a material difference between the abstract right of veto and the constitutional right. They were found taking the ground that unless that Chamber was allowed to pass finally on matters of local concern it was of no further use. (Cheers.) They took the ground that they were discussing nothing less than their charter to legislate, and it was their duty to stand up for that charter in its integrity and in its entirety. (Loud cheers.) On the other hand, gentlemen opposite, true to their ignoble past, showed by their arguments their willingness to encroach upon the rights of the people. They cared not how much they strained the power of veto or how much of the right to legislate on matters of domestic concern they surrendered. They expressed their willingness to shake the very arch of Confederation if they could only serve party interests. He was astonished to see the usually fair leader of the Opposition display a partisan spirit, and charge the Government with introducing those matters for party purposes. (Hear, hear.) He asked them to notice who brought these questions forward. The Government were acting on the defensive, defending Ontario's charter given by the Act of Confederation, and they would have been false to their trust if on the floor of that House they had not reiterated their intention of again passing such a Bill, and maintaining inviolate the right of that House to legislate in such matters. (Cheers.) If gentlemen opposite felt troubled with the discussion it was one for which they had to thank their Ottawa friends for, for had our rights been conceded the necessity it would not have arisen. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Morris) it seemed to him had been fighting shadows in his able speech. No one questioned the abstract right of veto, but they contended that by constitutional usage there were certain principles and precedents laid down, and that the abstract right was one thing, and the constitutional propriety of using that right another thing. (Cheers.) The hon. member's contentions therefore were directed against arguments which had not been advanced on that side of the House. When the representatives of the four Provinces many years ago were discussing the compact of Confederation they saw many difficulties in the way. They saw different people, different tongues, different creeds, and diverging interests in this wide land. Therefore, in order to avoid friction as far as possible the thoughtful men who discussed the future decided that the Provinces must surrender to the Dominion the right to legislate on one class of subjects, and the right to the Provinces to legislate on any other and distinct class of subjects. It was admitted that in matters of local concern essentially domestic the right of the Provinces should be supreme and unquestioned. (Cheers.) The matters reserved to the Central Government were matters affecting the whole Dominion. What test had they to apply as to the use, admitting the technical power of veto. They had precedents and a report on the subject, issued by Sir John Macdonald when Minister of Justice in 1853. It was said that the Governor-General in Council had the power to exercise the veto. What was the first question he asked? It was, "Does the Act in question transcend the bounds of Provincial authority on matters of domestic legislation?" By that test this Act should not have been disallowed, and the act of veto was an interference with the sacred rights of that Chamber. (Cheers.) Secondly, does the Act in question assert a principle or refer a claim which could be prejudicial to the interests of the people of the other Provinces? Hon. gentlemen knew that no principle was asserted in the Streams Act which could by the wildest stretch of imagination be supposed to affect the rights of the other Provinces. The Act asserted that one of the most important interests in the Province was the lumber industry, and that it was advisable to protect, foster, and encourage that industry. It was not a question of McLaren or of Caldwell, but it was what was best for the general lumbering interests of Ontario. The third question the Governor-General would ask was, "Does the Act in question affect the rights of the minority in regard to education?" and of course that issue was not involved in the present case. The memorandum issued by Sir John Macdonald in 1853 was one they wished to abide by as a test to apply to the proper use of the veto power. Under it the first question was, Is this wholly illegal or wholly unconstitutional? In the second place, "is it wholly unconstitutional or partly unconstitutional?" In the third place, "Does this Act come under the class of cases in which there is concurrent jurisdiction with the Federal, or does it clash with Dominion legislation?" and fourthly, "Does it affect the interests of the Dominion?" The two tests he had submitted were practically the same, and submitted to these the Act should not have been disallowed, and it was an unwarranted interference with the right which the people of this Province imagined they had. (Cheers.) The question was not raised one moment too soon. They were referred also to a correspondence which had taken place between Mr. Blake, when Minister of Justice, and the Home authorities, and it was well that Mr. Blake had taken the stand he had in reference to the question. The Home authorities laid it down that the Governor-General, as an Imperial officer, could revise our legislation, and secondly, that as Governor alone he could revise our legislation. Mr. Blake pointed out that the people of this country could not brook such doctrines, and the Home authorities abandoned their contentions. That House, if true to its own interests and to the trusts imposed upon it must, he declared, resist every encroachment on its right to legislate. He declared, secondly, that they could not suffer dictation from the Federal authorities—(hear, hear)—and it was dictation, he contended, when those authorities presumed to disallow measures so clearly within the competence of that House. The various functions of Government, collecting revenue, providing for the insane, the deaf and the blind, in administering justice, and establishing a system of education, were all important, but altogether they were secondary to the question as to whether they had or not certain defined rights as to legislation. (Cheers.) For the last ten years he had heard it boasted that they had local self-government, and he would ask

if that notion was nothing but an idle conceit. He was glad that it was left to the Conservative party to advance the doctrine that they were not possessed of this local self-government of which they had for so long been proud. (Hear, hear.)

It being six o'clock, the speaker left the chair.

After recess.

Mr. HARCOURT, resuming his remarks, paid a high compliment to the treatment of the subject of disallowance in the speech of the Commissioner of Public Works. The member for London (Mr. Meredith) complained that it was unfair to tie down Sir John A. Macdonald's hands in reference to his memorandum on the question of disallowance. Sir John's political history in the past went to prove that it was a very difficult matter to tie him down. There were two occasions, however, on which he was known to be tied down, once when he was tied down in reference to certain infamous telegrams which he sent, and when he was found to be tied down, hand and foot, to the chair of the President of the C. P. Railway. The member for London (Mr. Meredith) had said that the Reform party had no policy and no principles, and that they were stealing the policy of their opponents. He would never sit still in his place in that House without making a protest against such a charge, and he had no hesitation in saying that it was not in the mouth of the Conservatives to make that statement.

Mr. MEREDITH—Hear, hear.

Mr. HARCOURT said that Sir John Macdonald could not be accused of giving up his principles, because he never had any. But he would correct himself for the benefit of Sir John and his supporters opposite. Sir John had one principle to which he had been consistent all his life, and all his followers had been consistent to it. That principle was "get office; get it honestly if you can, if not get it any way." (Cheers.) Sir John had another principle corollary to that, viz., "having got office hold on to it; if you cannot hold on to it honestly hold on to it anyway." (Laughter and cheers.) The hon. member for London in his speech of the previous day had said that he was prepared to go to the country on these two great issues. The hon. member's course had been a fatuous one, and he (Mr. Harcourt) would not be surprised if he would attempt anything. By his course he was fast rushing on to an untimely political end. He would tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that when that end arrived the political epitaph of their leader would be "untrue to Ontario, too loyal to Sir John." (Cheers.) After the elections of 1879 the people of both shades of politics in this Province were surprised that the hon. member for London came back to the House with so small a following. He was also surprised that the hon. gentleman came back with such a small majority, but after listening to his arguments for the last two weeks, and noticing the unpatriotic and he had taken on these two questions he had got over his surprise, and he was only surprised that his following was not smaller. The hon. gentleman need not wait for the elections. He would guarantee that he could easily find some Reformer who would discuss with him at the polls these two great questions without delay, and if he would come to the counties of Welland or Monck he would be duly advertised and would get as warm a reception as he could desire. (Hear, hear.) The member for Glengarry talked of the profoundness of these questions, and said that they were such that the laymen in the House could not properly understand them. The legitimate result of such an argument would be that they should not vote on questions that they did not understand. But they were understood thoroughly, both in the House and in the country, and nothing better could happen the Reform party than that the whole issue of the coming elections should be narrowed down to these two principal points. (Cheers.) When he listened to the noble definition by the leader of the Government of what true loyalty was, and when he heard his contrast of what true loyalty was with the assumed loyalty of hon. gentlemen opposite, then he concluded that while the Reformers had such a leader the Reform standard would never be trailed in the dust in this Province. (Cheers.) He would say further that so long as the Conservative party submitted to a leadership which adopts the policy of the member for London in reference to those two particulars so long were they doomed to sit in the cold shades of Opposition. Hon. gentlemen spoke of the rights of property, and complained that in the case of the Streams Act they had been invaded, but what about the rights of property in the whole Province? What about our right to 100,000 square miles of territory? He had always given his hon. friend credit in his (Mr. Harcourt's) constituency of being fair in debate, but he asked if he had been quite fair and courteous that afternoon in the way that he accused the Attorney-General of bowing to Sir Alexander Campbell. He asked if the hon. leader of the House had bowed to any one in this matter. He asked the hon. leader of the Opposition if he could conscientiously state one occasion on which he had shown himself to be a coward, or had acted submissively to anyone. The Province would owe the leader of the House a debt of gratitude for the stand he had taken on this one question, if for nothing else. (Applause.) Who were the cowards? The men who would submit to dictation from Ottawa. Those men only could be branded with cowardice who would allow a leader to say to them, "You must in the Chamber at Toronto do such and such, and take such and such a stand as to these two great questions." (Applause.) If the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition had been truly loyal, and a true statesman, he would have gathered his followers around him, and said—"Our duty first and last is to the Province of Ontario; our fealty to Sir John at Ottawa is another matter," and the moment that he told them to ignore the rights of this Province, he told them to stultify themselves, and undo the work they have done. He was telling them to do something that they could not do, that their trust to their constituents forbade them doing. (Applause.) As to the amendment which the hon. member for London had moved, he would simply say that he wished to dodge the issue that was before the House and the country. (Cheers.) The hon. member for London while excited had told the House that his leader at Ottawa was a cunning old fox. The hon. member for London was trained after the policy of that same old fox. In reading between the lines of the amendment offered by the Opposition he could see