

constitution of Australia, is entirely incorrect. (Hear ! Hear !) No such proposal as this has ever been dreamed of in any part of the civilized world before. The hon. gentleman, if it is original with him, may have the satisfaction of knowing that no great mind has ever jumped to the same conclusion as he did. But supposing it was the case in Australia; the position there is entirely different. In Australia the legislative councils are now elected by manhood suffrage, the same as the houses of assembly, and it is proposed that the Senate of Australia shall also be elected by manhood suffrage. But is it proposed that when the two Houses differ they shall be turned in to vote together ? Not at all. What is proposed in the constitution of Australia is that if there is a deadlock between the Senate and the House of Commons, both Houses shall be dissolved, and after they have come back from the election they will then vote in a common chamber and decide the question. There is no necessity, therefore, for this proposed machinery.

The hon. gentleman knows right well that when the Senate, in the exercise of an imperative duty, rejected the Government railway scheme, all he had to do to make that scheme law was to dissolve the House of Commons and get a majority returned which would pass that bill over again, and thus remove the difficulty, because in that case the British constitution comes into play. (Cheers). Under that constitution, whenever the House of Lords rejects a Bill from the House of Commons, they do it because they do not believe that the promoters of the Bill represent the country. It is then the duty of the Government of the day, if they still insist on the Bill, to dissolve the House, appeal to the country, and get a new House of Commons to pass the same Bill '*ipsissima verba*,' and the House of Lords will then accept it without the slightest hesitation. Therefore, as there is to be a dissolution in Australia and an appeal to the country before a vote is taken, how can any man say that there is any parallel or example to be found in Australia for what is here proposed. That proposal is to take away all the security which the present constitution of Canada gives to the smaller provinces.

I do not intend to detain the House further than to show what are the facts with regard to the Drummond County Railway Bill. Does the right hon. gentleman not know that he has himself confessed that he and his Government were all wrong in that measure, and that the Senate were right ? Does he not know that the public records of this country prove that by the rejection of that Bill the Senate of Canada saved something like a million dollars to our people. That is the position, and the right hon. gentleman finds himself hoisted by his own petard. That which he assumes as a ground of complaint against the Senate of Ca-