

March 2.

would not be nearly so anxious to have the Dominion Government relieved of the power if it were not for the fact that the head of the Government was Sir John Macdonald. He believed it was safer to have the veto power in the hands of men who were responsible to the people rather than that it should revert to Downing street, whence it came, to be handled by men who were not responsible to Canada. The hon. member claimed that the real object of the Attorney-General in wishing that the veto power should be given to the Imperial Parliament was that he might win additional constitutional fame in contests that might then arise, just as he had already won fame in his contests with the Dominion. For he would admit that the hon. gentleman had won fame, luck somehow having been generally on his side. The hon. gentleman said he was also willing to admit that the Attorney-General was a fairly able man, and made a very good Premier so long as they could not get a better one. (Laughter.) He was good enough the other day to shake hands with Sir John Macdonald at Government House, but he thought it was too much for the Reform party to claim that the reported conversion of Sir John Macdonald the other day was a direct consequence of that shake-hands with the Premier of Ontario. The hon. member concluded by advising the House to consider calmly the resolutions and accept just so much as they could approve of.

Dr. GILMOUR said that his friend from Kingston had varied the proceedings by preaching a sermon, but had not stuck close to his text. He frankly confessed he would rather see the veto power remain in the Dominion of Canada, but the conduct of the Dominion Government—the manner in which they had abused the veto power—had driven the Provinces to seek redress in another quarter.

Mr. HESS said he was a native of Germany, but was just as loyal a subject of the British Crown and just as good a Canadian as the Minister of Education, although that hon. gentleman did come from Scotland. He charged that the hon. Minister of Education had thrown out an unnecessary slur upon Germany when he had called Bismarck a tyrant. There were a great many Germans in Ontario, and they would not forgive him for having alluded to the German Chancellor in this way. The hon. member also stated that the hon. Minister of Education would reside in Germany a great many years before Bismarck would make him Minister of Education there. He concluded by expressing a general disapproval of the resolutions.

Dr. McKAY said that the Opposition in the debate had departed widely from the subject before the House. He believed the onus of resisting Federal aggression in Manitoba had fallen upon the Liberal party; but a majority of the Conservative Association of Winnipeg had declared in favor of the resolutions of the Inter-Provincial Conference, namely, that Provinces should have the right to build their own railways with their own money.

Mr. CRAIG said that the Premier had asked the Opposition to lay aside their party feelings, but he had not made the same request to his own followers, nor had he told them that they were free

to vote as they pleased. He proposed to vote against the resolutions. The Premier had claimed that the Provinces should have the power to pass an insolvency law, because the Dominion Government would not do so. Why did they not ask, for the same reason, that the Provinces should have the power to pass a prohibitory law? The hon. gentleman defended the Senate in its present form, stating his objections to an electoral Senate.

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

After recess,

Mr. BALFOUR continued the debate. He denied that the Attorney-General had introduced partisanship into this matter. It was not so. The Attorney-General, as a matter of fact, had studiously avoided doing so. He asked the House to consider the question entirely upon its merits. But the hon. gentleman who led the Opposition seized the opportunity of raising the war cry, and at once waved the red flag and beat the tom-tom in the shape of his manly bosom. He had introduced partisanship into the debate and then hon. gentlemen opposite had found fault with the Minister of Education because he had to some extent replied in a similar strain to that in which the leader of the Opposition had spoken. Hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to consider that the powers that the Provinces possessed came to them from the Dominion; that, in fact, the Dominion had created the Provinces. As a matter of fact the case was reversed. It was the Dominion which received its power from the Provinces—the Dominion which had in fact been created by the Provinces. And who was it that had first attacked the powers of the Provinces? On the authority of Sir George E. Cartier it was Sir John Macdonald himself when he had attempted to further his project for Legislative Union. Hon. gentlemen opposite were in the habit of referring to the Provincial Parliaments as if they were mere Municipal Councils, but this was not the intention of the Fathers of Confederation. The speaker quoted Judge Sanborn and Judge Loranger to show that judicial opinions concerning the powers of the Provinces were that they should be very extensive and not by any means of the nature of powers possessed by County Councils. He claimed that hon. gentlemen opposite were attacking those who formed the conference in a very unjust and unfair manner. The majority that we have in this House, it is claimed, came from gerrymandering, but let us see how this Redistribution Bill affected us at the last election. Why, the Conservatives gained a seat in Bruce and another in Muskoka, and they (the Conservatives) only lost one in Grenville. This bill deprived the Government of one seat in Stormont and another in East Middlesex. We gained Algoma and the City of Toronto. The next result is that the Liberals lost one seat, which would not have been lost but for the passage of the Redistribution Bill. These hon. gentlemen tell us that we are inciting the Province to rebellion, but we cast the imputation back indignantly, and claim to be as loyal as hon. gentlemen opposite. He went into the history of the Annexation