

can only suspect, if they are fighting with some particular local object in view, I submit it is hardly fair to detain the House for such a purpose. If in the Supplementary Estimates similar grants to those are proposed, if the system is continued, if this sort of thing is to be renewed, that will be a perfectly fair and just object to contend against, and if it is proposed to continue such grants in future years, I think the country, and I trust the majority of the members of this House will come to the conclusion that they will have no more of them. But, in my opinion, and I do not like to use terms which might be considered offensive, it is not only unreasonable but bad tactics for hon. gentlemen opposite to waste their strength on a point on which the Government can make out a very strong case in their behalf. The country will not think any better of hon. gentlemen opposite for pursuing a course which I think might, without very great objection, be almost termed factious under the circumstances. I have no right to expect that hon. gentlemen opposite will adopt my opinion, but that is the view I hold with regard to the present course that is being pursued, a view which the country will be very likely to take, and hon. gentlemen opposite are not going to make much by pursuing this course, I do not say with regard to the principle involved, but with regard to this particular grant.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) In answer to the remarks just made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), I would say that we must not decide now what should be the future policy of the Government in respect to expenditure for public works. It is true that we have more in the Province of Quebec less minor towns than there are in the Province of Ontario, but we have the great city of Montreal. And although the Province of Ontario may have a larger number of minor towns, that is no reason why all the money for public buildings should be spent in that province, and that it should receive more than its share of the public moneys. As to items of this nature—I do not say so as a reproach to the Government, for Ontario being the largest and the richest province of the Confederation it has also contributed its large share to the public revenue—but I think that it has received as much as it was entitled to. It has been liberally treated by the Government and I do not see why the construction of public buildings in the Province of Ontario should be opposed, even if they are to be in places with less population than certain minor towns of Ontario. For it must be remembered that in the Province of Quebec the great city of Montreal has prevented the forming and developing of a large number of small centres such as could spring up in Ontario at great distances from large cities. As to what my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) said in concluding his speech, that he, in the position of the member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier), would be ashamed to make such a speech as that which the hon. member delivered in support of the grant given by the Government for the construction of a public building in his county, I am most surprised at this confession of sensitiveness to shame on his part. I believe that if the hon. member for Montmagny was in the position of my hon. friend for Laprairie, he would not be stifled by such an unusual feeling as that of which he spoke. I

believe that on the contrary he would defend vigorously a grant from the Government for a public building in any place in his county.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) If I could not be elected otherwise.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) We have already heard the hon. member for Montmagny claim Government aid for some river improvements. The hon. member for Nicolet has done the same. He asked for public buildings for the town of Nicolet. Now, notwithstanding all the boasting of the hon. member for Montmagny, I can say that the hon. member for Laprairie is as sure of his county as he is of his.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Oh, no.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) And let my hon. friend be replaced by a Conservative member, if his request be granted, you would see all the hon. members of the left rise one after the other, as they are doing now on this occasion of a vote for a public building in the village of Laprairie, and condemn the expenditure. It would be the same for Nicolet. Let the request of the hon. members be granted, and all the hon. members of the left will now approve either by words or silence; but let him be replaced at the next election by a Conservative member, and we will then see hon. gentlemen show themselves again just as inconsistent, contradict themselves and condemn what they will have approved. My hon. friend for Laprairie quoted the words of the ex-member for his county, a Liberal, who strongly supported the Government on this question. Why have not the hon. friends of the ex-member for Laprairie (Mr. Doyon), when this gentleman congratulated the Government for having decided upon the building of this office at Laprairie, why, I say, have not the hon. members of the Opposition protested at the time? We fully know why. They feared that in making the least protest against a grant for Laprairie, then represented by a member whom no timidity restrained, and who was free-spoken in this House, they would have been well dressed by Mr. Doyon. They knew that his voice would have been raised against the friends of his party. That is why the austere virtue of the hon. members for South Grey, for South Oxford, for Queen's, for Wellington, the austere virtue of all the hon. members who are scandalized to-day by the building of this post office at Laprairie, had no words of protest on that occasion. The County of Laprairie was then represented by a Liberal.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Would the hon. member be good enough to say if at that time it was a sum of \$16,000 that was voted?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) knows very well that for all public buildings which are put up in any part of the country, money is first asked for the expenses of expropriation, of the making of the plans, &c., the preliminary expenditure. My hon. friend knows that \$3,000 were first voted for the purchase of the land, and clever as he is—he must have understood that consequently the building was to cost a pretty fair price. He knew it, and the objection which is made now is totally futile. I am told the site was given. Well, the \$3,000 were then voted for the plans and the preliminary work. The Government did then as is