

Mr. BOYS: Then that driveway must come beside or through the square in question, and surely it forms part of the general scheme of the commission. If that be so, why is the work not left to the federal commission?

While I am on my feet, I would like to say that if it is the intention to pave that area, that does seem to me to be a serious mistake. What is the sense of doing that? I thought it was to be a park, and that is what we all understood. The idea of putting a cement square right in the heart of Ottawa, which is hot enough in the summer time as it is, is absurd. If we want to improve that area, surely it would be much better to have it laid with grass, with perhaps a fountain or something of that kind. I can hardly believe that the federal commission should contemplate paving it.

Mr. STEVENS: And perhaps use boiled tar.

Mr. BOYS: We have had some experience with creosote and boiled tar in connection with the square in front of the Chateau. I think the minister ought to give us some more definite idea of what is intended, unless he expects us to vote this sum blindly. We do not know what the size is, we do not know what the intention is, we do not know whether it is part of the general scheme, or whether it is something being undertaken by the Public Works department apart altogether from the general scheme for which we have already voted a very large sum of money. The minister ought to give us some information. This plan was passed around the house, and I certainly did think at the time that it was to apprise us as to the intention of the Federal District Commission, but now when we want to use the plan in connection with this vote, although this area is shown on the plan as part of the federal commission's scheme, we are told that the commission has nothing to do with it, and that it comes under the Public Works department. Why should they be separated unless it is to get more money?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I thought I had made it clear to my hon. friend that this expropriation of buildings west of the post office has been carried on by the Department of Public Works, and not by the federal commission.

Mr. BOYS: The expropriation, certainly.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, and the ownership of the property will be in the Public Works department as soon as the values are ascertained. The ownership is really vested in the department now.

Mr. STEVENS: What was offered by the government for this property?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Speaking from memory, something in the neighbourhood of \$600,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Is that all?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, but I want to say that these plans are more or less tentative. The plans of the federal commission will be followed as far as they can be followed by the government in connection with making this part of the general scheme, but I am bound to state to my hon. friend that the expenditure here is being borne by the Department of Public Works, and the work is being done by the department, and not by the commission.

Mr. BOYS: Are we to understand that the tearing down of the Russell block comes under the Public Works department too?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, that is federal commission work. The part which the Public Works department is doing is the part in the block in which the post office is situated.

Mr. STEVENS: And we pay that \$600,000 out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, here is an amazing situation. There is a good deal of laughing on the other side; apparently this is a joke. The other day the Prime Minister made a very long and apparently a very carefully prepared speech in which he presented to the house what he described as an elaborate scheme for the beautification of this capital and to add to the dignity of parliament hill. In presenting that scheme he rather appealed to the house for support on the ground that wisdom dictated that a large sum should be appropriated, even though it was to be spent over a period of years. Therefore he introduced a separate bill for a grant of some three million dollars.

But what are the facts? We have this bill for three million dollars to be handed over to the Federal District Commission. In addition to that we have a prospective vote of \$600,000 for a property which is part of the scheme; we have this paving vote for \$30,000; we have a vote of \$500,000 or more for the New Edinburgh mills which I understand were