

Railway Commission offices, \$1,000; White Way, Wellington street and Post Office—which includes the lighting of Connaught Place—\$1,300; contingencies, \$11,849.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand that we pay for the lighting of some of the streets in Ottawa?

Mr. McCURDY: Yes, we pay for the lighting on Wellington street in front of the Parliament buildings and other Government buildings on Wellington street. The same applies to the Laurier bridge across the Rideau canal, and the square in front of the Grand Trunk station.

Mr. McKENZIE: I can understand that if we cut a canal across a street we must put a bridge across, but I do not see that we should light it. The city itself should light the city streets. This arrangement strikes me as extremely illogical.

Mr. McCURDY: It is part of the agreement with the city of Ottawa that we should do this lighting. My hon. friend is aware that although cities are supposed to light the streets, residents in a particular area may voluntarily contribute to secure additional lighting. If the city of Ottawa were to undertake to light the particular areas under discussion the lighting would not be of the character that we now enjoy; it would be a dim, religious light.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is the first time I have learned that we are lighting streets in Ottawa.

Mr. McCURDY: We pay for the lighting only on or in front of property owned by the Federal Government. This is not a new item; it has been voted for many years.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is only now brought to my notice. It must strike the minister that we are doing altogether too much for the city of Ottawa. If it is proper that we should light Wellington street, then every farmer along the highway between here and Toronto might claim to be entitled to lighting in front of his property. As for lighting the grounds on Parliament Hill and areas of that kind, that is all right, but I do not see why we should be called upon to light Wellington street. It would seem as if the city could ask for anything it wants and get it. I must express myself as being against this kind of thing; to me it is most extraordinary and absurd.

Item agreed to.

260½

Departments generally—care and cleaning departmental buildings, including \$100 to E. Snowden for firing noon gun, \$385,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Now, is that firing of the noon gun done for us? I presume this gun is fired after the House closes and when many of us are a thousand miles away—

Mr. DENIS: And we do not hear it.

Mr. McKENZIE: And we cannot hear it. It should be so arranged that we hear the gun, and it should be so fired as to register the time at the different places in which we live. Now, seriously, I protest against furnishing powder and shot and attendants for the firing of a gun at Ottawa at every season of the year, whether we are here or not. I was for some years in the legislature of Nova Scotia. A gun is fired in the city of Halifax at certain set hours and my good friend who was Premier of that province for several years can testify that there never was an item in the Estimates presented by the provincial Government to provide for the firing of a gun at Halifax.

Mr. McCURDY: That expense was provided by this Government.

Mr. McKENZIE: It seems that in Ottawa, however, with the many other things, we have to pay for the firing of this gun. It is all right to allow a wharf to go to pieces and the poor man's boat to be smashed up on the shore, but it must be seen to that the gun on the Hill in Ottawa is kept going. The minister would make a name for himself by looking into the many peculiarities and absurdities that exist as between his department and the city of Ottawa and by cutting out many of these things. Let the city look after its affairs and we will look after ours.

Mr. McCURDY: Judging from my experience in inaugurating a reform in regard to district engineering offices, I am not encouraged to continue if I must rely for encouragement on any approbation received from my hon. friend. There was a sufficient saving effected in that reorganization to fire many guns, many times during the year. But to speak seriously, as a matter of fact this item has been staring my hon. friend in the face in the Estimates every year since 1909. I think he was in the House at that time. That is the year when this vicious practice referred to was initiated, and every year, year after year, he has cheerfully voted \$100 towards this expenditure.