

to vote a sum of approximately \$100,000 for the betterment of the battlefield memorial at Quebec. That was under the guise of a vote similar to this, and the defence put forward by the government was that the money was largely for the purpose of preserving historic memorials in the city of Quebec. We have this year, on page 60 of the estimates, a vote of \$180,000 for battlefield memorials; the amount last year was \$200,000. A bill has been introduced this session granting to the government permission to spend \$75,000 per annum for ten years, or \$750,000, in addition to the grants I have previously mentioned, in relation to the battlefield memorials. There is no question in my mind as regards the right or the wrong of this vote. We have no desire on this side of the house—certainly I have none personally—to do anything that would detract from the memorials which we should preserve in this country. But I have a decided opposition to spending \$100,000, voted last year, and \$150,000 this year, in addition to various sums in the future under the guise—and I say this purposely, under the guise—of providing a residence for His Excellency in the province of Quebec. If this money were for the purpose of a residence in that province, then each province should be given exactly the same treatment. But the fact is that this is simply for the purpose of having the vote passed more easily through the house. I for one am prepared to vote against any estimate of this kind, especially in view of the fact that we have provided, as I have said, \$75,000 per annum for ten years, and that there is a vote of \$180,000 in the estimates this year, in addition to the \$200,000 last year for battlefield memorials. While there are so many places where the expenditure of public money is necessary, I am prepared to vote against this or any other item of a similar character.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I am really surprised to hear the hon. gentleman state that he will vote against this estimate for repairs to the citadel of Quebec.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is not correct; I am not prepared to vote against that and I never said I was. I am prepared to vote against any vote of money to establish a residence for His Excellency in Quebec or anywhere else.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: My hon. friend knows that this amount is to repair the governor general's quarters at Quebec.

Mr. ARTHURS: No, it is not; the \$70,000 is for carpets.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: The vote is \$150,000.

Mr. ERNST: There is \$70,000 for furniture.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: That is to rehabilitate the residence of the Governor General in the citadel of Quebec.

Mr. ARTHURS: What about last year's vote?

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: This is to complete the work. May I point out to my hon. friends opposite that the residence which we are discussing is the place where the Prince of Wales lodges when he is in Quebec; it is the place where King George himself put up when in Quebec in 1908. If there is any property that should be maintained by this country it is the citadel and the fortifications of Quebec. But it is always the same: every time money is asked for Quebec an objection is raised. What about the \$9,000,000 for Ottawa? What about the \$100,000,000 for Toronto?

Mr. ARTHURS: One hundred millions?

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Yes, if you take the whole amount voted for Toronto. This session we are to vote \$10,500,000 for Toronto, but hon. gentlemen opposite do not say so much about votes for Toronto or for Ottawa. I am not prepared to say that the amount voted for Ottawa was not justified, but there was no great opposition to it.

Mr. ARTHURS: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is entirely out of order.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I want to say that every time an amount is requested for the city of Quebec hon. gentlemen opposite raise objections.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): That is not correct.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: The hon. gentleman cannot mention a single instance where objection has not been taken to votes provided for the city of Quebec.

Mr. CANNON: The discussion which has taken place so far has disclosed the fact that members of the committee are at least unanimous on one point, that is, that our historical monuments throughout the country should be maintained. There has been no dissenting voice to that suggestion, so the question which I would like to bring before the committee is whether this vote is really for the maintenance of a historical monument or whether, as some hon. members have contended, it is giving way in a too generous spirit to extravagant and altogether unnecessary expenditures. What is the Quebec citadel?