

vince was neglected. Its coast line was as long as that of any other Province, a large portion of it being on the Atlantic. He insisted on this point, because he was satisfied that, after the attention of the hon. the Premier had been called to it, he would be prepared to take the claims of the Province into consideration next year.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he hoped he would always take into consideration the public interests, whether they were connected with his own or any other Province. He claimed that the Government had carried out that policy, and that the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) had no ground at present for complaint. He remembered the time when over half a million had been spent on piers in the Lower St. Lawrence and nothing in Ontario; and when an equal amount was spent on slides and booms in Quebec and nothing in the other Province. No person had complained of that expenditure.

Mr. LANGEVIN: The elections were carried against us on that question.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Let us see what we spent.

Mr. TUPPER: I do not think we can balance the accounts of all the Provinces to-night.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had not raised the question; that was done by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin), who had endeavoured to make political capital out of it. He could not, however, pass by the subject altogether without assuring the House that no injustice had been done to the Province of Quebec. With regard to what the hon. gentleman called the harbour of Chicoutimi, it was at the upper end of a large, deep river. It was not a harbour, but a mere landing, and there was a great difference between a landing place in a river, and a similar place for shipping in a harbour. He did not think it was the duty of the Government to build wharves at that point. He protested against the allegation that the Province of Quebec had been neglected. The Government would fulfil its duty without regard to any local or sectional consideration whatever.

Mr. LANGEVIN.

Mr. MITCHELL said he objected to the hon. the Premier referring to matters which took place fifteen or twenty years before Confederation, when the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec were flying at each other's throats. The county which he represented had not had justice.

Mr. TUPPER: We are not coming down to counties.

Mr. MITCHELL: I represent a county which has not had justice done to it.

Mr. TUPPER: I can compare favourably with you in that respect.

Mr. MITCHELL said then the hon. member for Cumberland had not done his duty. He entered his protest against such a large expenditure being made on the harbour of St. John, when he was informed that nothing was to be done this year at Miramichi. He contended that a breakwater should be built at Point Escuminac, which was one of the most exposed points on the shores of New Brunswick. He had asked that a small sum be put in the Estimates for erecting a breakwater at that point.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 261, to provide for the expenditure likely to be incurred in connection with the proposed visit of His Excellency the Governor General to Manitoba, \$8,000.00,

Mr. MITCHELL said this was an item new in its character, and, as its adoption would establish a bad precedent, the House should give it some little attention. Too much money was spent in paying expenses connected with the Government; the highest and the lowest official seemed to have his travelling expenses paid by the country. He thought this would be an improper appropriation of public money; it was highly improper to vote sums of money for the pleasure trips of His Excellency.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said this item was put in at the suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite, who objected to such expenses being charged to "unforeseen expenses." He thought the hon. gentleman underrated considerably the real practical value that had been