

mark in replying to his colleague in regard to the particular vote that was then under consideration. As I said, last year a deputation headed by the late member waited upon the government stating that they were entitled to consideration. I had no intention of reflecting on my hon. friend in any respect whatever. I said that every citizen was within his right in making an application and supporting it by the assistance of other citizens of the town in question. If my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) criticises us very unfairly and unjustly on some votes made for outside constituencies, he must not get so hot if we take our own time. We are within our rights as long as we are not offensive in our language, and as long as we do it in a parliamentary manner, the hon. gentleman must not get cross and scold. I have recognized the importance of the city of Toronto as well as he has done; I think he has always found me an active supporter of the institutions and of the commercial and business interests of that city, and I have done everything that I could to advance its progress. I propose to do so in a public way in future, notwithstanding the attack made upon me by my hon. friend. I suppose that the reason I am called upon to defend myself is that he was very much in earnest in opposing this vote, and thought that the town of Clinton should not have the same consideration as a large city.

Mr. CLARKE. I would be sorry to get the reputation of being a scold. I appeal to the records to show that I have not taken up the time of the House in criticising harshly or adversely the votes asked by the government. What I objected to was that occasion should be taken by the hon. gentleman of this vote to Clinton to drag in Toronto. I spoke with the greatest possible respect of the ministers of the Crown. I said, and I say still, that I think the Minister of Public Works should have been franker in his treatment of the reasonable request made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) in asking upon what principle these grants were made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He asked a question as to what particular vote I supported. Other representations were made to me by the deputation. If the hon. gentleman had been attending to the wants of the city of Toronto he would know that they asked for three more public buildings.

Mr. CLARKE. I was quite aware that it was the intention of the hon. Postmaster General to ask that three branch post offices be erected. I heard what the hon. Postmaster General had to say. The hon. Postmaster General was not in his place or we might have criticised the wisdom of establishing these branches rather than providing a central post office near the railway station. I took the opportunity a few years

ago of making a statement in the House to the effect that notwithstanding the technical knowledge that the hon. Postmaster General has acquired since he has been at the head of the Post Office Department the public interest and the interests of the people would be better served if there was a central post office near the chief railway station than by establishing branch post offices. I paid a great deal of attention to what the hon. gentleman had to say when making reply to the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), and I expressed regret that he was not in his seat at the time when these appropriations were asked for. The hon. gentleman has admitted very frankly that the appropriations asked for by the deputation from Toronto are appropriations in the general interest. I may say that the city of Toronto only asks what it believes itself to be entitled to, and that in making the request that is made on this occasion it is merely asking that the public generally shall be enabled to reap a greater advantage than they have reaped in the past from the industrial exhibition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The people of Clinton think the same in regard to their appropriation.

Mr. CLARKE. I was going to say so far as the appropriation of \$50,000 asked for the industrial exhibition is concerned, the object for which it is asked is one that commends itself to the wisdom of this House. And, as far as the \$200,000 is concerned, we are merely asking that tardy justice be done for the injury that has been wrought to the city of Toronto in the past, for the injury that has been done the Toronto harbour through the action of the government in days gone by. We are asking that the harbour should be put in first class condition and we believe that if this were done a substantial advantage would be given, not only to the people of Ontario, but to the people east and west of the city of Toronto by reason of the greater facilities for the shipment of different kinds of commodities.

Mr. DAVIS. I should like to say a word in reference to the complaint made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is all out of order. Hon. gentlemen are discussing questions absolutely and entirely irrelevant to the item under consideration.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman put me in a false position. The hon. gentleman tried to make it appear that—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) has a right to answer the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman made the insinuation when he was on his feet that I was opposing a certain grant of money that was made for the harbour of Toronto