

inconsistent, and mentioned instances in that House in which he claimed that the Attorney-General had depended upon the Dominion's veto to disallow an Act passed by the House against his desire. He did not wish to use harsh terms, but he could not help asking, who was the traitor? He used the word in a Pickwickian sense—the traitor.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess,

Mr. MEREDITH, continuing, said that this branch of the case was presented to the country as it was intended to be. He stated from data that some Provinces are not in a condition to assume increased taxation. He apprehended that the additional million dollars are not to be raised without direct taxation. What Province is called upon to bear it? Why, the Province of Ontario. He asked them to read the statement of Sir Alexander Galt that no addition should be made to these sums, which would have to be done in case of increasing these subsidies, and it would have to be done at the expense of the Province of Ontario. Since Mr. Mowat has got into office he can talk about millions as if they were very insignificant sums. This is quite different from the position which he (Mr. Mowat) formerly assumed. Mr. Mackenzie's declaration was that of every dollar that comes into the treasury two-thirds were contributed by Ontario. Applying Mr. Mackenzie's rule, this Province would be contributing a larger proportion of the sum than any of the other Provinces, at a great loss. He would like to know what course was intended to be taken in case the people's representatives at Ottawa opposed these propositions. It seemed his duty to oppose to his utmost these resolutions. He thought the people of this country wanted rest from agitators. (Applause.) He did not understand how a free country could transfer its power of controlling the taxation. We have enough for both parties to do without attempting to tinker with the Constitution. The men who saw it their duty to build up this country deserved our greatest confidence. Hon. gentlemen might talk about the enormous responsibilities of this country, but they are not out of proportion to its resources. And the great Conservative party has been true to the natural heritage. If both parties would combine to develop the mineral and other resources they could be better employed. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have reproached us with being disloyal. We are just as loyal as they are. He proceeded to quote an opinion given by Mr. Blake, as Minister of Justice, in reference to an Act passed by the British Columbia Legislature, amending the License Ordinance Act of 1867, and laid stress upon the fact that Mr. Blake had stated that the Act, if not amended, should be disallowed, and had used the argument that it was an attempt to regulate trade and commerce, was a violation of sound principles of taxation, and was of mischievous tendency. He claimed that he had demonstrated that the intention of the framers of the Constitution was that the power of disallowance should be exercised. No one could read the debates on Confedera-

tion without seeing that the men who framed the Constitution were desirous of recognising that there were minorities in the Provinces whose rights should be protected. Hon. gentlemen opposite referred to this question as if it were a question between the Reform and Conservative parties. They dealt with the question as if the Dominion were some foreign Power. We formed a portion of the Dominion and we had representatives in the Dominion Parliament who had a right to speak upon these matters. Hon. gentlemen opposite had done much to disintegrate the Dominion by continually raising Provincial cries, setting Province against Province, setting the Provinces against the Dominion. He (Mr. Meredith) was in favor of a strong Federal power. In the United States every change that had been made in the Constitution since 1797 had been in the direction of strengthening the central power and limiting the local powers. It was essential for the preservation of the Dominion that there should be a strong central power. As to the question of disallowance, he asked hon. gentlemen opposite to point to one case of improper disallowance of an Ontario statute except the case of the Streams Bill. The only other case which had been complained of, from one end of the Dominion to the other, was the disallowance of the Red River Valley Railway Bill. There might be differences of opinion as to the policy of the Dominion Government in that case, but hon. gentlemen opposite, lending their support to the unlawful means by which the people of that Province were resisting the Federal power, were doing much to disintegrate this Dominion and destroy its foundations. If the people of Manitoba might defy the Federal law with regard to railways they might defy the Customs law or any other law of the Dominion. It was the duty of every man who loved his country to see that no Province should successfully resist the Federal law.

Mr. FRASER—What Federal law?

Mr. MEREDITH—The hon. gentleman knows that the Dominion Government have disallowed the Act, and that what is being done there is unlawful.

Mr. FRASER—That is not a Federal law.

Mr. MEREDITH, continuing, referred to the proposal to transfer the veto power to the Dominion Government, and said that that would be a step backward in the history of responsible government. Never before had any Government so degraded the people of this country as to declare that they were unfit to be entrusted with a power which Great Britain had conferred upon them. He repudiated that position, and he was not going to be such a craven as to approach the throne with such a declaration. He quoted from Mr. Blake, claiming that he had expressed an opinion against the transfer of the veto power to Great Britain. He quoted from another authority who contended that if such a step were taken, our legislation would be considered, not by Great Britain, but by a second or third class clerk in the Colonial Office. He held that the power of disallowance was a reserved power which ought to be exercised with great caution. If the hon. gentlemen asked for its abolition why had they not proposed to abolish that