

Lines Bill. Why the hesitation to bring this bill down the second time? In 1910, a Branch Lines Bill, not in the same terms, but with the same objectionable features, was sent up by the House of Commons. Mr. Graham was then the Minister of Railways and Canals. We amended that Bill, but Mr. Graham refused to accept our amendments. He called for a conference. The conference was held and we agreed on a compromise Bill which both Houses accepted. That was, I think the Act of sensible men—but notice the political relation. We were a liberal senate, dealing with a Bill introduced by a liberal government, in a non-partisan way, as every one admitted. But when we deal with a Bill brought in by a Conservative Government on precisely the same grounds, and for similar reasons, then we are partisan. Now is not that unfair? Is it not absurd? I am surprised. I am not censorious and I do not mean to be discourteous—for we do not govern in this country by being censorious, and I hope we do not govern by being discourteous,—but we govern as Englishmen are said to govern by speaking out our mind. What right have we to be charged with partisanship? We dealt with a Bill from our own friends on precisely the same grounds that we dealt with the Bill brought in by the present Government, and for similar reasons. Why should that Bill not be brought in again? Have we got to that pass in Canada now; or has the House of Commons begun to be influenced by that high spirit of haughtiness, that they are not prepared to discuss with the Senate or allow the Senate to reconsider Bills that are amended? Is that the way to deal with the country. How is it in the United States when appropriation or revenue Bills are sent to the Senate, of which the Senate does not approve? Why, there is a conference. On Wilson's tariff Bill the conferences were half as long as the discussions on the Bills originally, and resulted in a settlement. I am speaking to this side of the Senate and am prepared to say that if the Government has difficulty in accepting our amendments, we are prepared to go into conference. If we cannot agree, nothing happens. By the next session we may change our mind, or the House of Commons might change theirs. I would refer hon. gentlemen to the change which took place in Sir John Macdonald's mind, in regard to the union of Canada. He thought it should be a legislative union, and not a federal

union. It was a sensible change; by no other form could the union have been achieved. Sir John Macdonald changed his mind in regard to the Franchise Bill introduced in 1885. The first Bill was brought into the House in 1883. It was not passed. The Bill that was finally passed, was very different from the first Bill. Every legislator knows that new conditions require new applications, of rules and principles, and to say that this Bill, if it is important to the country, should be withheld because the Government dread that the Senate might throw it out, is not the stand of high-class legislators, nor is it high-class statesmanship. There are sitting around the leader of the Government, in the other House, men who have changed their minds, men who have voted for the Naval Bill—and have thus acted the very opposite to the views they presented to their constituents. They have quite a right to change their minds, and perhaps others could change their minds on some of these measures if they thought it in the public interest that they should. There is no reason why the Bills should not be presented again.

Then we have the Naval Bill which is not to be brought down again. The reason given for that is rather peculiar. They thought the honour and dignity of the country could be better maintained by allowing the status quo to remain, rather than to face the effect of what they call the rejection of the Bill. Here is what the right hon. leader of the Government said in the other House a few days ago.

It has been avowed and declared by leaders of the Opposition and by their organs that the Bill if introduced again under present conditions would again be rejected in the Senate. We have no reason to doubt that such is the determination of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Under these circumstances we do not regard it as desirable either in the interests of the empire or of Canada that the Opposition majority in the Senate should be given another opportunity of rejecting the Bill and of again bringing discredit to this Dominion and detriment to the empire. Nevertheless we are firm in our determination that these ships shall be provided, and we adhere to the declaration which I made on the last day of the past session, and which I take the liberty of repeating.

That is rather a grave statement to make. Last year there was an emergency. We all felt there was something in the air. We were troubled. I confess I was a good deal troubled. But as the session went on the emergency seemed to diminish.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Evaporate.