

Separate School Act, in which, arguing against disallowance, he had said that "the Legislatures should feel that they were legislating in reality and not in sham," and that the Dominion Government ought not to become a Court of Appeal from the Provincial Legislatures. His hon. friend (Mr. Meredith) should have applauded the conference for their efforts to crystallise the opinions of his great chief at Ottawa. The next question to be considered was where should the veto power be placed? The Dominion Government had abused the trust, and another trustee had to be looked for. His hon. friend was very indignant at the proposed transfer of the power to the Imperial Parliament, contending that it was a surrender of responsible government. Was it responsible government for the Minister of Justice at Ottawa to have the power to veto the legislation of the great Province of Ontario? He said that if the Ottawa Government abused the power of disallowance they could be punished by the people of Canada. Supposing that in the case of the Province of Prince Edwards Island the power of disallowance were grossly abused, what could its six Federal representatives do in a House of 215 representatives with a majority utterly subservient to the party in power. Mr. Meredith was very much shocked at the idea of going to Downing street, but he forgot that it was at Downing street that judgment was passed, perhaps by a third-class clerk, upon the legislation of this great Dominion. They were asking that the veto power be transferred to the Imperial Government, which had always acted with justice and courtesy towards the Province, and had given them redress when they were treated with injustice by the Dominion Government. Coming now to the matter of the Senate and the hon. gentleman's defence of it, it was an easy matter to criticise the proceedings of a conference, but a more difficult matter to suggest a reasonable improvement. Surely the hon. gentleman would not undertake to say the Senate had answered the purpose for which it was originally designed. It was a place generally

for those who had failed in political life. The members of that body did not have to be elected. That was one of their greatest privileges. Had they to be elected many of them undoubtedly would never have been there. Did the Senate ever devise any legislation? Only one Act of any importance could be credited to it—the Canada Temperance Act—a poor record for so many years. What did the Senate represent as it was constituted at the present time? Nothing but the Premier of Canada.

#### THE DESIGN OF THE SENATE

was that both political parties should be represented on terms of fair equality in the Senate. But nobody would pretend that there was any idea of fairness in the present system of appointments. They were all of one side of politics. Now and then, indeed, as if to give a shadow of fairness to his actions, the Premier appointed an eminent Liberal like the Hon. John Macdonald, but what could one Liberal do among so many Conservatives—fifty or sixty of them at least. These resolutions proposed to infuse new blood into the Senate, to make it an active legislative body instead of allowing it to remain what it was at present

—nothing but a dilettante Court of Appeal. (Applause.) He came now to the charge made by the hon. gentleman who had last spoken, that the Hon. Mr. Mercier had got all the financial advantage in the proceedings of the Quebec Conference and the Hon. Mr. Mowat had got all the glory. That was not so, for Hon. Mr. Mowat got a great deal more than glory. He got a very substantial financial advantage by the resolutions. (Applause.) The position at present was that the Maritime Provinces were receiving what was practically subsidies from the Dominion Government while the Province of Ontario was receiving nothing at all or next to nothing from the Dominion Treasury. Under the system proposed by the resolutions Ontario would have a much fairer share of the finances of the Dominion Treasury. The hon. Minister of Education closed with an eloquent peroration, his concluding remark being that he hoped his hon. friend would withdraw his opposition to the well-intended efforts of the gentlemen who met at Quebec to improve the Constitution of which the leader of the Opposition was himself an admirer; and that every hon. gentleman would see that the future of the country depended to a great extent upon the smoothness with which political operations moved and upon the loyalty and heartiness with which we can everyone approve of the Constitution in all its details. (Applause.)

Mr. H. E. CLARKE followed. He denounced the conference at Quebec as a rebellion in embryo, condemned the whole affair as being an attempt at Annexation, and warned the members of the Government that the ghost of these resolutions would haunt their chairs for many a long day to come. He then claimed that the whole affair was absurd, and to prove it quoted statistics in support of his contention that 48½ per cent. of the voters of the Province had voted in favor of the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, and what did that mean, he would like to know.

Hon. A. S. HARDY—It means that we stay here. (Loud laughter.)

Mr. Clarke continued his speech some time longer, and at 10.35 p. m.,

Mr. EVANTUREL moved the adjournment of the debate and the House rose.