

it is only "greenhorns" who are scratching their desks. Is that parliamentary language?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think it is parliamentary.

Mr. CASEY. I would define "greenhorn" for the hon. member for Algoma to mean a very new, raw, fresh and inexperienced member. If the hon. gentleman thinks that is offensive to him I will withdraw it, but I am sure nobody but a "greenhorn" would feel offended at my application of the word.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I rise to another point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not think the hon. member has satisfied this House as to his interpretation of the word "greenhorn." If he applies it to hon. gentlemen sitting on the back benches of this House, in my opinion it cannot be parliamentary language, and his duty is to withdraw the offensive expression.

Mr. CASEY. I declared my willingness to withdraw the expression if the hon. gentleman felt offended at it. I tried to do it in a way that would not hurt the hon. gentleman's susceptibilities, but his susceptibilities are so very tender that he feels like a piece of proud flesh, and you cannot refer to him without hurting him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He called you a piece of proud flesh.

Mr. CASEY. I withdraw the word "greenhorn," if he thinks it an offensive name to call him, and I trust hon. gentlemen opposite will allow me to come to the question now before the House. I think the hon. gentleman was rather too severe upon the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) who was the first to introduce these national recriminations. I am sure that the hon. member, knowing him as I do to be a thoroughly good-natured and good-humoured man, did not mean to be so offensive to the people of Scotch nationality as his words would seem to imply, and I think that the hon. member for Algoma read him too severe a lecture.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I did not say anything about it.

Mr. CASEY. Representing a riding chiefly composed of Scotchmen, I must on their behalf protest against such references being made in future. Now, I understand from the hon. Minister of Public Works that this post office was within three miles of the Montreal post office. It seems to me that is rather too near a great metropolitan post office to justify the erection of another public building costing as much as this is expected to cost. I would like to ask the Minister on what grounds he justifies this?

Mr. OUIMET. Because the necessity of the postal service demands that there should be another post office there.

Mr. CORBY. I have listened to the remarks made by the hon. member for West Elgin and the hon. member for Lincoln, and I must say that no better evidence of obstruction can be given than the attempt to convert my language into an insult to the Scotch nationality. That is only got up as a piece of clap trap for political purposes. As my best friends in West Hastings are Scotchmen, they know better than to suppose that I would insult their nationality. They supported me at the last

election and they will support me again, and they will not listen to such clap trap statements as have been made by the hon. member for West Elgin and the hon. member for Lincoln. I had no intention to insult the Scotch nationality, and if I did so, I withdraw what I said. Hon. gentlemen opposite are only talking to-night for political purposes; but let them go on and do their best.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for West Hastings does me an injustice, because I distinctly stated that I did not suppose that he intended to be insulting to the Scotch nationality. The hon. Minister, in reply to my question, says that the erection of this post office so near to the Montreal post office can be justified on the ground that the public service requires it. That is a very large and comprehensive answer. It is as much as to say that this post office is needed because it is needed. I am aware that that is a natural justification to put forward, but what I wanted to obtain from the Minister was some details as to why it is needed. The reasons do not appear on the face of the Postmaster General's Report, in the census returns, or in any of the public documents laid before the House. It is clear from these documents that St. Henri has a smaller population and yields a smaller postal revenue than a great many places that have not obtained post offices. It has been alleged by some hon. gentlemen on the other side that we are attacking these appropriations because they are made in the Province of Quebec. We are doing nothing of the kind. We are pointing out that if such places as St. Henri and Laprairie are justified on the basis of population or of revenue in receiving post office buildings, there are many other places in the Province of Quebec much more entitled to receive them on the same grounds. I took the trouble last night to give a list of about 130 places in Quebec which returned a greater revenue than Laprairie, and it would be quite easy to form a list of Quebec towns yielding a larger revenue than the one now under discussion. We have had from the Minister the same justification that we have had all along, that in the first place the money has been already voted for this purpose, and in the second place that the public needs require it; but he has not undertaken to show us what means he has used to ascertain that. The conclusion we are obliged to come to in this case is the same as that which we came to in the Laprairie case, that this building is being erected wholly for political reasons. The County of Hochelaga, in which it is situated, returns at present a supporter of the Government. He has not invariably been a solid Conservative, but such little grants as this will no doubt contribute to brace up his allegiance to the party, and secure the support of his constituents at the polls. These are the only objects that can be achieved by this grant, and we have no doubt that this is the object of the Government. It is because we feel this that we have determined to give such votes as this the fullest and most exhaustive discussion, and to do so at such a length as will draw the attention of the country forcibly to the system pursued of the unlimited bribery of constituencies by means of grants for public works.

An hon. MEMBER. Tell us something new.

Mr. CASEY. I am very sorry that the statement is not new; I am very sorry that this practice is as old as the Government. I deeply regret