

wards Montreal, except that the channel below had been deepened, but the channel above was still in the same state as the Carillon Locks. The fault was not with the contractors, and he felt assured that the hon. the Minister of Public Works had been misled. He felt a little delicacy in speaking about the matter, as his brother was a contractor. He would hand the hon. gentleman plans and specifications which would show him that, in damming the river four or five times, a larger amount of timber had to be used than was credited by the Department.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 250, Public Buildings, \$4,000,

Mr. FLEMING said, in the absence of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) he would remind the hon. Minister of Public Works that he had promised to consider the advisability of building a post office at Brantford.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the Government did not consider it an absolute necessity to take a vote for that place this year, but there would be, most likely, a vote taken next year.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 251 and 252, Harbours and Breakwaters, \$6,000,

Mr. LANGEVIN expressed regret that the Government had not thought proper to comply with the opinion given in the House that something should be done for the Province of Quebec in this respect. He must say that the Province of Quebec was nearly forgotten.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the remarks of the hon. gentleman were sectional. Although there might not be much given to the Province of Quebec this year, sometimes it might receive five times the amount given to other Provinces. Since Confederation, Quebec had received \$13,895,492; Ontario, \$14,379,299; New Brunswick, \$16,398,207; Nova Scotia, \$9,544,239. For public buildings there was expended in Ontario, exclusive of Parliamentary

Buildings, \$883,000; in Quebec, \$1,162,243; in New Brunswick, \$354,328; in Nova Scotia, \$144,749. They found in other services similar anomalies. They could not possibly expect, however, that in any Province there would be every year an equal distribution of the public money, because the expenditure was in accordance with the necessities which arose. The hon. gentleman would find, if he examined the votes for harbours and piers, that for Ontario there was voted this year \$28,500, and for Quebec \$22,000, which did not embrace nearly \$20,000 expended on Rimouski Pier, which was charged to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway. To the Province of New Brunswick \$97,000 was voted, but \$80,000 was really for work undertaken for the benefit of commerce in the harbour of St. John. The sum of \$31,500 was voted to Nova Scotia, which, undoubtedly, required more than any other Province in the Dominion, in consequence of the extent of its sea coast. His hon. friend, however, would find that no neglect whatever had been shown to his Province, and he did not like to hear a leading member of the House speak as if there was a refusal to do justice to any Province.

Mr. LANGEVIN said he did not complain of the amounts voted to the other Provinces, but he affirmed that the Province of Quebec, though its members had made its wants known to the House, could not obtain justice. The hon. gentleman had quoted the vote for harbours and piers in the different Provinces. Last year the vote stood as follows:—Ontario, \$62,200; New Brunswick, \$86,000; Nova Scotia, \$36,500; Prince Edward Island, \$24,750; Quebec, \$5,000. The representatives from Quebec had repeatedly asked for improvements. A vote had been asked for improvements at the entrance to Chicoutimi harbour, but there was nothing for it in the Estimates; nevertheless, it was important that something should be done. There were reports made in regard to the Lower St. Lawrence, but no sums were placed in the Estimates for works there. Why was the Province of Quebec placed in that position? He did not suppose it was purposely done, but still the Pro-