

change of government, and was suspended for a time. I am glad to see that work has been resumed. The route may serve to export fifty million bushels of grain.

I have a word to say about the next clause which refers to a contribution for the maintenance and improvement of our highways. The press has reported that I signified my approval of the Highways Bill of last session. The press mis-reports me. I did not approve of it; I could not approve unless I entirely denied every liberal principle which I ever entertained. The grant to highways last session had no constitutional foundation to stand upon, had not anything within the four corners of the constitution to justify it. The law of the constitution is that every money vote made by parliament shall be designated for a particular purpose, not only as to the purpose but as to the place where it is to be expended. What would you think of the Minister of Customs if he should take one hundred thousand dollars to build custom house offices and never tell us where they were to be built? Or if the government took ten million dollars to build railways and never told us where they were to be constructed? Indeed, Sandfield Macdonald was beaten in Ontario because he took one million five hundred thousand dollars to build railways without stating where they should be constructed. We then stated a clear principle, which we have not departed from to this day, and I could not deny it in view of my principles and the constitutional point involved. No government has a right to give a million dollars or ten dollars for highways without designating the highways to be improved. I shall not draw inferences; I shall simply say the constitutional reason for being specific as to the application of the money is this, that parliament thinks it wise not to impute dishonesty to a minister, but not to put temptation in his way. Parliament is right. We say daily here, 'Lead us not into temptation,' and here the government propose to bring in a Bill contrary to that prayer. By Act of Parliament they propose to repeal that part of the prayer. It was said of Charles I. that he took, 'Not' out of the ten commandments and put it into the Creed. The hon. gentleman is saying 'Lead us into temptation,'

and putting it into an Act of parliament. Had we passed that Bill last session the consequences even now might have been more serious than they are. We will vote money for highways if hon. gentlemen will give us proper conditions. Let us have better highways—we need them everywhere, but we must have them without the political consequences that the Bill of last session would have involved. I have the honour—if you will pardon my personal allusion—of being the father of the highway system of Ontario. In 1901 I introduced a Bill setting apart money for the improvement of highways. One million dollars was the amount I asked to draw on from time to time as the highways were improved. Since that time Ontario has spent \$2,681,435 on highways. The province has paid out of that appropriation already \$893,811. The condition of the Bill was that county councils should designate the highways to be improved, that they should be built on a certain plan, and that they should be subject to the inspection of the government when built, and on the report of the inspector that they were up to proper standing, and that the by-law for their location was legally drawn, the money was paid. In a short time the results were obvious everywhere. Since then Ontario has voted five million dollars for similar purposes; Quebec, ten million dollars; British Columbia, five million dollars; Saskatchewan, five million dollars, and probably the other provinces will do something to the same effect. Now, if hon. gentlemen will draft their Bill so that the money for the improvement of highways will be used for the improvement of roads and that it will not be subject to the manipulation of politicians, good and well. That is the only basis on which money of that kind can be put at the disposal of the government. I know of only one vote that is granted without designating how it is to be expended and that is the grant for secret service. The minister will not tell what they propose to do with it, and will not report afterwards what they have done with it. We had in this country a similar grant of that kind early in the history of the Dominion, but that is the only grant