

other reserved power, the right of a Lieutenant-Governor to dismiss his Ministers?

SENATE REFORM.

He described the scheme of Senate reform proposed by the conference as a hermaphrodite scheme, as neither fish, flesh nor fowl. There was nothing like unto it in the heavens above or in the waters under in the earth. He declared that he was opposed to the appointment of Senators for life, as being contrary to the spirit of the age. Mr. Meredith admitted that the Senate was capable of being improved, but thought the scheme presented was hardly one that would improve it, besides being an entirely novel scheme. The hon. gentleman claimed also that in the conference Hon. Mr. Mercier had got the better of Hon. Mr. Mowat and that he had got all the money, whereas Hon. Mr. Mowat had got "all the glory" and nothing more. He suggested also that the resolutions which touched on the financial matters were inconsistent with the policy of at least a large section of the Reform party, for, whereas these resolutions proposed that certain revenues should be collected by the present Protective system, the great organ of the Reform party, THE GLOBE, was advocating Free Trade.

Hon. G. W. ROSS, in replying, said:—The members on this side of this House and that Government to which I have the honor to belong repudiate the hon. gentleman's remark about disloyalty. We have always devoted our energies to trying to lay the foundation stone of a great empire and to conserve its best interests. (Applause.) We can show legislation passing over a period of fourteen years that will accentuate that statement. One would have thought that he would have discussed each resolution from a constitutional standpoint, but such has not been his purpose. He was not speaking to the House, he was speaking to the country, he was laying the foundation stone for that election which nobody dreads more than himself, and possibly from that very cause he expects to be able to do himself and his party some good. I expected to have heard some good logical arguments, but we hear nothing but the customary loyalty cry in regard to secession, in regard to partisanship, that I find has always been the custom of my honorable friends opposite, and why? I suppose, because like Poe's Raven, they can say "nothing more." I am disappointed at the attitude of my hon. friend concerning these resolutions. When we allege that the veto power has been exercised in Ontario he says we are going to appeal to Great Britain, and raises his loyalty cry. How did the Americans deal with their Constitution? Why, like statesmen, like men who love their country, who, perceiving that the Federal compact was not perfect, set themselves resolutely to work and removed the difficulties, and by those means they strengthened the Federal compact; and this teaches us our duty. We must do as they did. England has no written Constitution. So long as any grievance remains there it must be removed by written amendments, and we propose to remove ours by the same means. I will leave it to the House to say whether my hon. friend has not approached his subject in a partisan spirit. (Applause.) My hon.

friend says these resolutions are characterised by a partisan spirit. I defy my hon. friend to place his finger upon a single line that discloses the partisan. My hon. friend is silent, because it is impossible for him to do so. So long as my hon. friend sits opposite he will always have the same cry, but he is a practical illustration of the engineer being

HOIST BY HIS OWN PETARD.

The hon. gentleman continuing, claimed that these resolutions voiced the sentiments of the people of Canada. He asked who were represented there? Why, all the Provinces, with the exception of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, and these two Provinces contained a population of about 120,000 souls, while the rest of the Dominion contained 5,000,000. Therefore it was not a conference that represented the Dominion of Canada! That is my hon. friend's logic! But I beg to tell my friend that the Dominion Government was notified, and Sir John Macdonald was notified; and yet he says the conference was not a representative body. I contend that you could not find a more representative body convened to consider a great public question than that which assembled at Quebec. Then my hon. friend maintains that the Government of Quebec is not representative of the Dominion because Mr. Mercier was elected upon a certain cry, which fact seems greatly to stir up the indignation of my hon. friend. I am not going to say on what sentiment Mr. Mercier was elected, but I maintain that he represented the best sentiment of the Province of Quebec. And what shall we say of hon. members of the House of Commons who have obtained their seats in a similar way—who were placed in the same position as the leader of my hon. friend opposite? Then my hon. friend was very much disturbed on account of Mr. Longley, Attorney-General for the Province of Nova Scotia, and his anxiety on that score seemed to me very peculiar. It seemed that the Province of Nova Scotia declared in favor of separation from the Confederation. Therefore the cry of disloyalty is again urged. How did the Province of Nova Scotia come into the Confederation? Was it not

WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE PEOPLE?
Nova Scotians were coerced into the Union by the leading men against their wishes and they had a perfect right to use any constitutional means to secede. It is very strange that Nova Scotia should be dealt with in this way, but not at all strange that my hon. friend should inquire into the characters of those men who led the debate in that Assembly. A gentleman conspicuous amongst them was Sir Charles Tupper, whose good old Tory principles have brought him also into the ascendency. Sir Charles Tupper led the Legislature of Nova Scotia at this time, and aided in coercing the Province of Nova Scotia into the Confederation. The power may be vested in the Central Government or it may be in a few individuals composing that Government, but the same characteristics may be found in the individual member as in the Government. I want to ask my hon. friend this question:—If Nova Scotia separated from