

letter in which, after the election of 1891, Hon. Edward Blake gave his reasons for withdrawing from the party, and that gentleman knew the Liberals better than he (the speaker) did.

Hon. Mr. Ross—You were one of us then. (Government applause.)

Mr. Carscallen—It has been said, and said truly, that the greatest and best of men change their opinions, but fools never. (Opposition applause.) He then read the letter, and after commenting upon it reiterated his objections to the proposal, the chief of which was that the mandate of the people had not been sought. In conclusion, he moved that the following words be added to the amendment of Mr. Whitney, expressing appreciation if the action of the Senate concerning the Drummond Railway and Yukon bills, "and that this House deprecates any change in the constitution of the Senate by which the equilibrium between the several Provinces and the Dominion of Canada, as established by the British North America act, may be disturbed."

#### Favors Abolition.

Mr. Graham concurred in all that had been said by previous speakers regarding the greatness of the British Empire and the fact the Britain was mistress of the seas. He did object, however, to the corollary that the House of Lords had anything to do with putting the mother country into that proud position. He esteemed the mother land in respect of her institutions, and appreciated the privileges which Canadians enjoyed as British citizens. But there was a nearer and dearer land which demanded their admiration, their adoration, and, if necessary, their life—that land was Canada. (Ministerial applause.) Mr. Whitney had argued that coercion had been vainly practised upon Premier Marchand of Quebec to induce him to pass a resolution in favor of Senate reform, but the force of this argument was destroyed by the subsequent admission of the Opposition leader that Mr. Marchand had consented to introduce and pass such a resolution. Had the Quebec Premier put such a resolution through, the old cry of French domination would have been raised. Out of the Conservative gripsacks would have come the old, moth-eaten arguments that Ontario was in danger from the encroachments of Quebec. By his action, therefore, Premier Marchand had deprived the Opposition leader of a cry that he would otherwise have raised. Mr. Carscallen had alleged that the members supporting the Government could not give independent votes, because they either had got favors from the Government or were in expectation of favors. Mr. Graham indignantly repelled the allegation, and he challenged the hon. gentleman to make a specific charge in regard to any member supporting the Government. He would then be promptly granted a committee of investigation, which it was very likely that Mr. Carscallen did not want. Mr. Graham ridiculed the idea that the reform of the Senate was prompted by the defeat of burglarious motives cherished by the Liberals, as suggested by Mr. Carscallen, and he called to mind the raids on the treasury which had been carried on under the

late Government. In this connection he uttered an indignant protest against the continual hounding of Hon. J. I. Tarte, and challenged that hon. gentleman's accusers to show one crooked act which he had committed since he joined the Liberal party. Mr. Graham did not see how Mr. Carscallen could do otherwise than vote for the Attorney-General's resolution, because during the first 23 minutes of his speech he had argued against decentralization in the Dominion. The Senate to-day had more power than Sir Charles Tupper or Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It had power to block the whole will of the people as expressed at the polls. Mr. Graham desired to be put on record as favoring the abolition of the Senate. Mr. Whitney had said he did not know of any newspaper or entity in the Province of Ontario that was in favor of abolition.

Mr. Whitney—I said except The Globe.

Mr. Graham—Well, outside of The Globe there is another entity, if you will permit me to call myself an entity. I am in favor of the total abolition of the Senate, because I think it is out of harmony with the democratic institutions of a young country like ours. And I need no stronger prop to my arguments than the speech delivered by the member for East Hamilton. He pointed out that we were too much governed, and declared that it was the duty of the Government to lighten the burdens of the people. He followed the argument up logically by saying that a way to lighten those burdens very materially would be to reduce the number of legislators. If the number of legislators is to be reduced, I would ask the hon. gentleman if it is preferable to make the reduction from among those who are responsible to nobody or among those who are responsible to the people? I believe that by the abolition of the Senate we could make a saving of \$200,000 every year. Multiply that by the time the Senate has been in existence, and then take the Yukon and Drummond County Railways, and see where the balance will be. (Ministerial applause.)

Taking it for granted that the Sen-

ate could not be abolished, Mr. Graham proceeded to justify the proposition for Senate reform. The Conservative press had said of the resolution that it would deform the Senate. The resolution proposed to dehorn that august body, to deprive it of its power to do evil and to preserve its power to do good. The Senate did not create the Provinces, but the Provinces created the Senate. Would it be argued, therefore, for a moment that the creating bodies had not the power to effect reforms when the Senate was out of harmony with Canadian sentiment? Sir Charles Tupper was represented as saying, "Let the matter be referred to the people." The question had been referred to the people, and they voted on it at the last election. Sir Charles Tupper was not always a stickler for a reference to the electors, and Mr. Graham quoted from the Nova Scotia debates the charge that the right hon. Baronet brought the people of that Province into Confederation without giving them a chance to pronounce upon the question.