

century. Would Mr. Chamberlain regard the petition of the people of this country as an impertinence? Mr. Ross very much misunderstood the tone of the Colonial Office, and the spirit in which the Imperial Government regarded the greatest of her colonies, if any remonstrance emanating from the seven Legislatures of Canada would be treated in the manner claimed by Mr. Whitney. Taking up the contention that the resolutions of the Quebec Conference had been unproductive of result, Mr. Ross showed that the contrary was the case, and he mentioned a number of reforms that had been carried out as a result of the meeting of 1888.

Where It Failed.

Mr. Ross heartily concurred in the statement that it was the duty of the Senate to protect the rights of the Provinces, but if Mr. Whitney could show him one instance during the last 30 years where the Senate had stood in the way of Dominion legislation in order to protect the Provinces, the former would ask the Premier to withdraw this resolution, or, failing to achieve that, would vote against the motion. Mr. Ross enumerated one after another the list of struggles for Provincial rights where the Senate might have sustained Ontario but had failed to do so. He asked if Mr. Whitney could point to any great measure that originated in the Senate. The hon. gentleman had charged the Liberal party with being a destructive party; that being the case, what party was the constructive party? He (the speaker) contended that throughout the history of Canada the Liberal party had been the constructive, the progressive, the popular party of the Dominion. The broadening of the franchise, the disestablishment of the church, the opening up and the development of the Provinces, the legislation for the workingmen, the laying of the foundations of the great educational systems, the closer binding together of the empire, these were due to the constructive genius of the Liberal party. In the last two years that party had built up a nation in Canada. They could go to Washington and tell the people there that if they did not negotiate with the people of Canada on fair and reasonable terms they could keep their terms to themselves; and the Canadian Ambassadors could return without sacrificing a title of Canada's honor, and retaining the respect and admiration of the people of the Dominion. (Government applause.) He referred to the Liberal party's settlement of the separate school question and its success in regard to preferential trade with Britain.

No Contradiction There.

Referring to the interview read by Mr. Whitney, he said he did not recede from the opinions therein, and could at the same time vote for the resolution without in anyway contradicting himself. The Senate might be reformed in various ways; its constitution at the present time did not adequately represent the public interests, nor did it represent active, aggressive, strong public opinion in any way. If the Senate was partly elected by the various Provincial Legislatures it might be better than now. But should it continue to be partisan, the next move was

to place it in a position where its partisanship could not be obstructive. The Liberal party, the progressive party, objected to the Senate for several reasons. It did not protect the Provinces, it was in danger of becoming a partisan body, its constitution to a certain extent unfitted its members for public service, and it did not represent the people, Canada being practically governed by the minority. If they felt that they were the natural successors of the great traditions of the British Empire, the rights of sovereignty and manhood, they would ask the Senate to hand back that sovereignty to the people of the country. For himself he would rather bear with the inequalities of the constitution than ruthlessly lay hand upon them. But they were face to face with a great principle which might interfere with the development and prosperity of the country, and they must be loyal to Canada, and, above all, to the people of Canada. He dwelt at some length on the manner in which, should the principle involved in the resolution be carried out, the House of Commons, the Senate and the Governor-General would act as one body, and measures approved of by the majority be put into effect. He asked those who knew the heroism of English literature and traditions if they should not emancipate themselves from any form of tyranny. They would be unworthy of their history and traditions and of their forefathers who had struggled for the liberty they now enjoyed if they did not arise to the importance of the present position and act like free and independent men. (Long continued Government applause.)

Calls it the Watch Dog.

Mr. Carscallen spoke of the record of the Senate with approval, and alluded to that body as the watch dog of Canada. In the rejection of the Yukon and Drummond bills it had done good service to this country. The Liberal party was said to be progressive, but its progress was on a par with that of the burglar—the burglar did not like to be interfered with, neither did the Liberals.

The debate was adjourned at midnight, Mr. Carscallen still having the floor.

Against Sunday Cars.

The Government to-day heard a deputation from the Lord's Day Alliance of Ontario in opposition to the Ottawa Sunday car bill and the bill permitting the Hamilton & Caledonia Railway to run on Sunday. The deputation consisted among others of Rev. Principal Caven, President; A. E. O'Meara, John A. Paterson, Rev. Dr.

Parker, Rev. R. C. Tibb; Mrs. Rutherford, President of the W. C. T. U.; R. M. Hobson and J. C. Copp, Toronto; Rev. J. Scanlon, Ottawa; Donald McGregor and Chas. Richards, Caledonia; Rev. T. Albert Moore and Rev. J. G. Shearer, Hamilton. Rev. Principal Caven was the chief speaker, and his remarks were on much the same line as at the Private Bills Committee the other day. The present legislation, he said, was in contravention of the law enacted in 1897 prohibiting the running of radial railways. The interpretation of the Lord's Day act was to be made the subject of a reference