

vinces of Canada, representing a large majority of the people of Canada, were perfectly willing and are perfectly willing to take that Bill just as we presented it. When we first introduced that Bill in Parliament the right hon. gentleman and his friends pretended to give it a half-hearted and lukewarm support. They debated it; to a certain extent they obstructed it both in the last session and in the previous session. Notwithstanding their pretended support of some features of it, at least in the first instance, they ended their career by standing up, every one of them in his place, and voting solidly against that Bill. We placed the Bill before Parliament in what we believed to be terms perfectly fair to every province in Canada. Further than that, the Minister of Railways and Canals and myself as well gave a distinct pledge, which we kept on both occasions, that when the vote was brought down for the appropriation of a certain sum of money in aid of the highways of this country, the Parliament of Canada would be asked to make that vote in accordance with the populations of the various provinces of Canada. We made that pledge. If we did not observe that pledge, it would have been perfectly competent for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and for their friends in the Senate, when that vote was brought down, to have taken the stand that the vote and the appropriation did not do full justice to the provinces of Canada. We had no intention then or at any other time of dealing with any of the provinces otherwise than in accordance with the pledge which we then gave; but my right hon. friend, or at all events his friends in the Senate—and I understand he takes full responsibility for their action—after he and his friends had voted to defeat that Bill, took upon themselves by their majority the still greater responsibility of inserting in that Bill an amendment which the Government had rejected a year before, and which they knew the Government would certainly reject again. Therefore, notwithstanding all the efforts of my right hon. friend to escape from the responsibility of defeating that Bill, I intend to fix that responsibility upon him and upon his friends, because I say it is due to them and to them alone that a vote of \$1,000,000 in the session before last and of \$1,500,000 last session, has not been made available for the improvement and maintenance of the highways of this country.

[Mr. Borden.]

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN: When the House took recess at six o'clock, I was speaking of the Highways Bill and pointing out that, as the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House had used their majority in the Senate for the purpose of defeating the Bill in two successive sessions we had decided that, until the majority of the Senate in the course of events comes in accord with the voice and will of the people of this country, it was useless and undesirable to take up the time of the House further with it; and therefore at this session we did not propose to introduce the Highways Bill.

There are at least four, and perhaps more, important measures which the Government has proposed to Parliament, and which the Liberal majority in the Senate has seen fit to reject or to encumber to such an extent with amendments that we could not accept them. I need only mention the Highways Bill, in two successive sessions, the Tariff Commission Bill in the session before last, the Branch Lines Bill, of which I shall say a few words in a moment, and the Naval Aid Bill of last year, of which I shall also speak.

The situation of this country with regard to its Upper Chamber is somewhat peculiar. Canada has less control over a majority in the Senate which puts itself in opposition to the popular will than any other dominion of the empire that I know of to-day. The colony of Newfoundland with one twenty-fifth of the population of the Dominion of Canada has infinitely more effective control over a situation of that kind than this Dominion. If friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, appointed during their tenure of office and before the will of the people was declared at the last election, are disposed to force upon us the question of the constitution of the Senate and the nature of appointments thereto—well, speaking for myself, and I think speaking for the great majority of the people of this country, we are ready to accept that issue.

The Branch Lines Bill of last year is a notable illustration of what I have just now alluded to. A resolution was introduced into this House by my colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane). The resolution was very broad in its terms, and, as he and I decided after its introduction and after some criticism had been made of it, that it was too wide in its terms, I myself drafted a modified