

of those transactions. Yet I am told the Minister of Public Works has declared that the resolution of Parliament passed on the eve of the general election was in no way binding on him.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is mistaken when he makes that statement. I never said that.

Mr. MULOCK. What did the Minister say, and what is the Minister's opinion on this question?

Mr. OUIMET. I should like the hon. gentleman, while he is speaking against time, to explain the difference between resolutions passed by Parliament, such as was passed the year before last and to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and the resolution by which Parliament decided to build this post office. Had Parliament a right to decide that this post office should be built? I suppose Parliament had the same right to adopt this resolution as it had to adopt the resolution a few years ago.

Mr. MULOCK. Last night the Minister of Finance professed to respect the resolution of 1890, but to-night the Minister of Public Works says it has been superseded.

Mr. OUIMET. The first resolution was passed in 1890. It was before the other.

Mr. MULOCK. We are now speaking of the resolution before the House. The Minister takes this ground now, that the general resolution passed by the House, laying down a certain principle, is not binding on the Administration; but, notwithstanding that resolution, the Administration can come down to Parliament with the recommendation of His Excellency to violate that principle for the purpose of a petty job. That is the doctrine which was laid down to-night, and I understand he has gone further and has said that he was going to see that the various rat holes throughout the Province of Quebec are to be filled up, if possible, with money collected from the people of Canada, on a principle repudiated by the resolution of 1890; that expenditure in the public interest can no longer govern, but his particular friends and supporters, political influence and patronage and all corrupting circumstances, shall be the ones to determine, in the administration of public funds, how he shall expend them. What is the use of public opinion succeeding in passing a resolution through this House, if the new Minister, out-Heroding Herod, says that he will repudiate all sound doctrine and set up his own will as the only thing to govern? That is what the Minister of Public Works has said, and, therefore, I say that Canada has made a most unfortunate selection in choosing him. I venture to say that there will be grave disappointment in the public mind when it is found what a terrible mistake has been made by His Excellency in seeking this adviser to administer this large spending department. The people of Ontario contribute a good deal to my hon. friend's resources, and when he tells us now, because he happens to be locally connected with the Province of Quebec, that he first intended to consider the interests of Quebec, and set up an unfair standard in order that this province will gain an advantage, I venture to say that he is committing treason against Canada. He is giving expression to a doctrine that will in time defeat both him and his Government, for I tell him

that no province will stand such a doctrine as that. He has made a huge mistake in awaking the local cry. There are other localities which ought to have their rights, and it is our duty, regardless of the localities from which we come, to sink all minor considerations for the general interest of the country. The Minister of Public Works to-night has given expression to a doctrine which if sanctioned by this Parliament would be the death-knell of this Dominion. We feel to-day in western Ontario that Ontario has no voice in the administration of our affairs. We feel that this is practically a Maritime Province Administration, but this is the first time that a member of the Cabinet has openly thrown off all semblance of disguise and declared that his administration shall be sectional in its character. I for one raise my protest.

Mr. OUIMET. It is very evident that the hon. gentleman was away from this House, or that he was asleep, when I spoke. In the first place he cannot understand a word of the French language, and when I spoke I spoke in French; but what I said I will repeat in English for the edification of the hon. gentleman. I never said that the Province of Quebec ought to be favoured more than any other province, but I did say, and I repeat it here, and I believe the whole Dominion will agree to it; I said that the Province of Quebec had a right to have its share in the expenditure of the public money just as well as any other province. I am not afraid to repeat that sentiment, and I will repeat it in Ontario when I have the pleasure of going there. I am quite sure that the people of that great province will not endorse the language of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) to-night. I know from experience that when we talk to an intelligent Ontario audience we are fairly listened to, and our arguments are received in a proper spirit. When we talk equity to the people of Ontario, when we talk fair-play and fairness to them, and when we talk equal rights for all, if the hon. gentleman likes that expression, we are courteously heard, and our arguments are not scorned as the hon. gentleman professes to scorn our arguments in this House. What do the hon. members from the Province of Quebec on the opposite side of the House say to the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock), which ought to be a cause of shame to the gentlemen from the Province of Quebec who hold on to his tail. It has been said here by the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) and by others of his friends, that no post office will be built in the Province of Quebec until those localities in Ontario and elsewhere which have the largest revenues are served first. That means that we will not have a post office in the Province of Quebec for twenty years perhaps, and yet the hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec on the other side of the House, are ready to swallow that, and are ready to swallow everything else when it smells of opposition to the Government. Well, let them swallow the lesson from the hon. gentleman representing one of the Yorks (Mr. Mulock), and I hope that they will be ready to place it before their electors in the Province of Quebec. Are we not entitled to have the expenditure in the Province of Quebec of some part of the public money, because, be it remembered, we pay taxes just as well as the people of Ontario? I venture to say that in the Province of Quebec per head we pay more taxes