

these are all the facts in regard to the Highways Bill.

Mr. BORDEN: Is my hon. friend referring to clause 6?

Mr. CLARK: The amendment made by the Senate provided that the money should be spent according to population, that is according to the way that my right hon. friend himself said he personally intended it should be spent. Clause 6 was cut out altogether, because the Government refused these amendments. But, with the five clauses and the Senate amendment, every cent of the money could have been spent upon the highways. No one on the other side will deny that. But the Government refused to spend it, without their precious sixth clause. The Senate threw out that clause and the Government destroyed the Bill. The action of the Government in this affair reminds me of an incident that occurred in my own professional practice. I happened to be present at the birth of a baby born with a supernumerary thumb—six digits upon one hand. With the help of the nurse and the approval of the parents I took off the extra thumb. The child looked better, and it lived and thrived. What would have been thought of the parents if they had killed the child because I took its deformity away? But this Government was much more unreasonable even than these parents would have been if they had killed this child themselves, for they killed their child and then blamed the Senate for doing it.

I thought it better to take up this highways matter at once. But a number of interesting things politically have occurred since last session. My right hon. friend referred to the Chateaugay election. I wonder he mentioned it, especially in connection with the Naval Bill. I wonder if he knows what went on in that election. The Chateaugay election was won by a double appeal. The first appeal was to the cupidity of the electors—and about that I do not want to talk. I do not wish to spend my time upon it, and, to be candid, I am afraid that such appeals are all too common on the part of both political parties in Canada. The great majority of the people of this country hope that the time is soon coming when we shall have purer politics in that regard. But there was another appeal made, that to the pusillanimity of the electors, and to that I wish to refer. I am personally concerned. Words that I used last year in the naval debate were

printed upon a leaflet and circulated in that constituency. I will read them to the House. I said, in the course of a few brief and imperfect remarks that from time to time I had to make last winter:

If the storm of which Mr. Borden speaks were to break, not a drop of Canadian blood would be spilt or risked.

When I used that language, in the innocence of my heart I believed that I was pointing out a defect in the scheme of contribution which would make it stink in the nostrils of every right thinking Canadian. But here it is reproduced as a recommendation of this measure,—and then the Prime Minister comes here and makes a feeble effort to revive his flag-waving. What a lot of tame jingoes my imperialist friends become when they get into the neighbourhood of Mr. Bourassa. There was another election in the recess which was quite a good offset to what happened in Chateaugay. I make my compliments to the Government upon the win they made in Chateaugay, especially to the imperialistic section of the Government. But there was an interesting election in South Bruce. My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) went down there. I do not know why the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) sent him. He seems to have made a very good diagnosis as to the scenes in which he himself should operate. I should like, by the way, to join my compliments, my very sincere and heartfelt compliments, to those of my right hon. friend and leader on the appointment of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). I think he knows that I am very sincere in offering them; but I noticed that when he went to that election he made the remark that the Government, everybody must admit, had been riding on a flood tide ever since they came into power. It occurred to me it was a pity he went there, he soon turned it into an ebb. It was not quite so apparent to some of us that the tide had been so strong behind them; certainly, it was not so strong as in the case of other governments that have come into power. The reason why I mentioned the South Bruce election was that the Naval Bill was an issue, a very distinct issue, in that election. I heard in Nova Scotia a most interesting instance of how it was made so. In Amherst, the Tory journalist wrote a long article—such articles were written all over the country—to the effect that this was an ideal constituency to test the naval issue. This gentleman wrote just such an article