

remain in this appropriation to cover the levelling of the site. My opinion is that by this vote the government is simply splitting the city of Ottawa into two sections or making two cities of it. It is making a paved square which the people from one part of the city will never cross in the hot summer, if we have such in Ottawa, or in the cold weather. The government is absolutely destroying the city and doing it for one purpose, namely to glorify and keep in power the King government.

Mr. CHAPLIN: A few minutes ago I asked the minister to give us the area of the piece of property which they have acquired and on which this vote is to be expended, but he is a little short of information. He tells us that the proposition is to pave four thousand square yards within the property or around it. From what I know of the property—and we pass it every day—four thousand square yards constitute practically the whole property and consequently the whole of it is going to be paved. Is the committee prepared to spend this vote of \$30,000 and \$8,000 of salvage on a proposition of that kind in Ottawa? The proposal of the minister is simply absurd, nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I apparently have not made myself clear with regard to the \$8,000 of salvage. We were paid the \$8,000. We did not pay it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I understand that quite well.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend was adding the two together.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The government have been paid \$8,000 for salvage. I presume with that \$8,000 they can do something; or does that money go into the treasury?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And \$30,000 is the money to be spent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That explains the matter but my remark still stands regarding the foolishness and inappropriateness of this. If these improvements are to be made around Sparks street, as the plan we have shows, the Ottawa Street Railway or somebody else should pay for them or part of them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister may be able to get his vote through but my hon. friends had better not make such a row or it will

probably be delayed more. My hon. friends are entitled to state their points of view; I am entitled to state my objection to this vote and I propose to do so. My hon. friends cannot get anything simply by calling "carried". This is an absurd vote. This appropriation of \$30,000 is wasted money. It is in addition to what we have already voted for Ottawa. After what we have heard this square should be paid for out of the \$3,000,000 appropriation and the government should not come back and ask us to vote more money in drips and drops as they are doing.

Mr. MALONEY: I should like to ask the Prime Minister if the immediate destruction of the post office building comes within the scope of his scheme of beautification, and if the destruction is not immediate, when he proposes starting to tear down that building.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is not the intention to tear down the post office for some years at any rate.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Do I understand that a contract was entered into for the removal of those buildings?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Has the minister a copy of it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Is it not customary in connection with the removal of buildings, to have the debris removed, that is, to have the property left in a reasonably clean condition? Any business man of acumen would have a contract drawn up to that effect and therefore a large portion of the expenditure which is now being made for the removal of the debris would not be necessary. Every business man making a contract for the removal of a building requires that the site shall be left in a reasonably clean and proper condition so that all he has to do is to erect his building without having to remove rubbish and other stuff left by the contractor. If a contract was made, why was a clause of that kind not inserted?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was in January, I think, and the ground was all covered with snow and ice at the time of the removal of the buildings. There was in the contract a clause such as my hon. friend suggests. Tenders were called for and a contract was entered into, the highest tenderer being given the contract.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The highest or the lowest?