

course. For fifteen years in Parliament, I have been advocating certain principles, and these principles I am anxiously looking to see carried now that we on this side have it in our power to do so. I desire to see every principle we advocated when on the other side carried out by us on this side. In this matter of public buildings, there was a clear understanding reached in 1890 that they should only be erected in places which contributed the largest revenue to the treasury and then only when the revenue of the country warranted their erection. We have nothing to show that the places mentioned in this vote are entitled to public buildings or that there is anything exceptional in their case which would justify a departure from the principle we have laid down and so persistently and strongly advocated, and therefore, if only for the sake of consistency which is proverbially a jewel, I feel impelled to move :

That the resolution be amended by striking out the appropriations of \$5,000 each for Kentville and Liverpool public buildings.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. My hon. friend from Wellington is perfectly within his rights in moving to strike out this vote. Some years ago the question of the policy which should control the Government in this matter was debated at great length, and a general principle adopted, which principle, we contended, was not adhered to by the late Government. It was stated the other day, and I had hoped my hon. friend would accept that statement, that this Government did not dissent from the principle laid down and were prepared to carry out the spirit of the resolution adopted. The hon. gentleman is of the opinion that the vote for this public building in Liverpool conflicts with the spirit of the resolution I have referred to. There may be some question about that. Liverpool is the shire town of the county of Queen's, it has no public buildings. It is a seaport town of some importance, and although the receipts there are not as large as in some of the other towns my hon. friend may be able to cite, that is not the only criterion by which we can judge the importance of a place and its title to a public building. Apart from that, the vote was assented to by the committee, and I was in hopes that the promise which the Government willingly made of its intention to proceed along the lines adopted some years ago would have satisfied my hon. friend. It is not the intention of the Government, as we have stated already, to erect a large building there but one of a reasonable moderate character. And considering that the county of Queen's has stood almost alone in the province of Nova Scotia for many years back, as regards expenditure on public buildings, and considering that the expenditure is to be very moderate and that this is an important

shire town, which has some little claim to consideration, I think my hon. friend might very well let the vote go, upon the assurance given by the Government that the policy and principle of the resolution adopted some years ago will be carried out by them. In carrying out that policy, we did strike out the vote proposed for a building at St. Martin, which clearly did not come within the spirit of the resolution. The vote for Kentville I should imagine would come within that spirit. It is the leading town in the great Annapolis valley, and I could not imagine that any one would object to it. I myself saw the small, cribbed, cabined, and confined place which is now used there as a post office, and I thought it was hardly creditable to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. You did not say anything about it ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No, not even at the public meeting held there before the election. At the same time, I thought that the conditions in Kentville were such as would justify a small appropriation. I trust my hon. friend will accept the assurance given that the spirit of the resolution will in future be carried out, and that we shall not even shave on the lines of that resolution, as he may think we are doing in the matter of Liverpool.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if the Government are prepared to make any distinct statement as to the limit beyond which they will not go in the erection of these buildings ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It is quite impossible at present, but I may give my hon. friend the assurance that the intention of the Government from the first was to put up a very moderate and economical building. There is no intention to build a large edifice which would overshadow every other building in the town.

Mr. SPROULE. I congratulate my hon. friend from North Wellington on his courage and good intentions in moving this amendment. All of us who sat in the last Parliament know how frequently and forcibly the hon. gentleman opposed this practice of building post offices in small places.

Now, he is carrying out that principle when he is supporting the Government. There is no doubt that it requires some moral courage to do that, because in doing it he is opposing his own friends. But I for one congratulate him on the course he has taken, and I am sure the country will do so as well, because it is an acknowledgment to the country that he is treating both sides alike, and that he was honest when advocating economy when in Opposition,