

of the front benches with being the greatest sinners. The gentlemen opposite were troubled to distinguish between loyalty to the country and loyalty to Sir John Macdonald. They held that the gentlemen who composed the Quebec Conference were not such persons as the members of the Government should be found in conference with, but he pointed out that they were the chosen representatives of the people of their respective Provinces, and showed that the leader of the gentlemen opposite at Ottawa was now treating with Hon. Mr. Greenway, of Manitoba, on the basis of holding in abeyance the power of disallowance. He believed that in supporting these resolutions they were voicing the sentiments, not only of

all Liberals, but of very many Conservatives; and recalled the refusal of the Conservative leaders to submit "that great constitutional change that was equal to a revolution"—the scheme of Confederation—to the people. He claimed that did the leader of the Opposition read the rest of those speeches of the "Fathers of Confederation," from which he quoted extracts, it would be seen that it was not expected that the veto power would be used by the Dominion Government, save in cases where the rights of minorities, especially religious minorities, were seriously threatened. After twenty years' experience it is

NOW COMPETENT TO ASK

whether the veto power should remain with the Dominion Government or not. He instanced the bills passed by the Ontario Legislature and vetoed by the Dominion Government and the disallowance of railway legislation in Manitoba, that produced a perilously near approach to revolt, as proof of the tyrannical use of this power, and argued from past experience that it is safer to vest the veto power in the British Executive. The Imperial authorities have not vetoed any Colonial legislation for many years, even sparing such adverse legislation as our "National Policy." He dubbed the leader of the Opposition "as a very great Radical," in that he favored not only the improvement of the Senate, but that it should be wholly elective. He (the speaker) regretted that they had any Senate to improve, but would willingly see it elective that it might be liberalised. The hon. gentleman was not pleased with the proposed scheme, but he must at least admit that it was not worse than the present arrangement. The result of the proposed plan would be that they would soon be "levelled up," and begin to represent the views of the people. He compared the Ontario Franchise Act with that of the Dominion, and contended that the latter had not only a cumbersome and expensive machinery, but acted very unjustly, disenfranchising at least 10,000 voters in Ontario. In closing, the speaker made an appeal to the Opposition to unite with the Government and go to the Dominion Cabinet and thence to the Imperial Parliament to obtain the changes in the Canadian Constitution that are sought.

Mr. McCLELLAND spoke against the resolutions.

Mr. SMITH moved the adjournment of the debate, which was carried, and the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

representatives of the other Provinces, and argued that if this

POWER BE VESTED ANYWHERE

it should be placed where the people may effectually avenge its arbitrary use. He combated the position of the hon. treasurer that under the proposed financial scheme the relation between the Provinces was identical with that arranged at the time of Confederation; and by an intricate calculation he endeavored to prove that in 20 years—from 1891—Ontario's population would reach 2½ millions, when her subsidy on the surplus would be but 60 cents per head, which limit Quebec would not reach until 70 years later.

Mr. AWREY congratulated the majority of the Opposition on discussing this matter in a non-partisan spirit and charged the occupants