

and the second is that there is a widespread confidence that he would not lend his personal authority to anything like a gerrymander. I share that view, and I shall continue to share it until evidence is brought to the contrary.

Now, there are one or two points in the Speech that I think the Opposition may fairly pass. We are promised an economical administration. There is a good deal of the compulsory feature that overtook the prodigal son in that promise. The fact is that that promise would have been more useful to the country, if it had been followed by performance, if it had been made two years ago. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), in the art of dissipating a fortune, has made the prodigal son a beginner. He got a legacy of \$50,000,000 of a surplus. That surplus has gone, and then he, who, I presume, is responsible for that particular paragraph of the Address, promises economy. Even deathbed or late repentances, however, are not to be discouraged in this world, and I can only express the hope that that paragraph of the Address will at any rate be carried out, and I am sure that is a hope which is shared by a very large majority of the people of this country.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has taken rather a peculiar course in the very lengthy speech which he has delivered to us. He has shown a distinct disposition to revive the controversies of last session, while he has dropped the Bills of last session. That is a most peculiar course. In fact, this is a very peculiar Government. Last session they gave us the Bills and they gave up the controversies. This session they have dropped the Bills, and my right hon. friend renews the controversies. Well, I can only say in regard to that that if there is a general disposition to renew the controversies of last session, we still have some physical strength and ideas left, and the challenge will be taken up at once. I am very glad to take it up in regard to the Highways Bill. There have been very numerous statements made about this Bill, and very peculiar statements. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche), who is usually a man of very moderate language, went into the west, and I think in the town of Minnedosa he said that the Senate had throttled or killed the Highways Bill. This is a fair selection of the words he used. There was some excuse for his using strong language on that occasion—I do not believe in using strong language my-

[Mr. Michael Clark].

self—because he was accompanied by no less an exemplar than the Premier of Manitoba. The Premier of Manitoba on that occasion referred to my fellow countryman in the person of the Postmaster General of Great Britain, first as a grampus and then as a jelly-bag Englishman. Well, they say that evil communications corrupt good manners, and so I can understand the strong language of my hon. friend.

Now, against all this talk about strangling and throttling and killing and throwing out, what happened to the Highways Bill? I have never found any difficulty with any audience in this country in getting them to be absolutely enthusiastic about the Senate's action in regard to the Highways Bill, when they knew the facts. This talk of strangling and throttling must all be given up when we come to the facts. There were six clauses in the Highways Bill. The Senate passed five of them. Is it fair controversy to charge that Chamber with having killed the Bill when they absolutely passed five-sixths of it without alteration? What was the sixth clause? My hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod) talks about this Bill having reached the hearts of the people of this country. The sixth clause was devised to reach their votes, and to reach their votes by using the money, as the clause gave them power to use it when and where they liked, and we know an election was on, and for the purpose of helping Tory candidates. Now, my right hon. friend says, in the only answer he gives to this charge, that he intends to fix the responsibility for the killing of this measure upon the Senate. My right hon. friend will not have the fixing of the responsibility. The responsibility will be fixed by the people of this country when they know the facts. He says that he and my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) expressed an intention that the moneys would be spent pro rata among the whole of the inhabitants of the country. I want to put it to my right hon. friend: is it a fair manner of conducting the legislation of this country that it should depend upon the expressed intention of any minister? Is there not a possibility of binding all ministers, so long as the Act remains in force, by the simple process of putting their intentions in the Bill? This they persistently refused to do, and by persistently refusing to do it, they showed that they wanted carte blanche to spend the money when and where they liked. Now,