

Agreement with City of Ottawa

we should not increase this grant to the city of Ottawa, particularly in view of the other sums that are paid in this connection, which run well over a quarter of a million dollars. I fear the tendency is to think the government is possibly a little easy. We find increased votes in different directions where there is no actual necessity for them. I would again urge the government to keep their hands on the purse strings a little tighter. I regret to see this increased vote to the city of Ottawa, especially in view of the other services that need money but for which a large number of us are not pressing on account of the present situation. I could mention a number of public works that are required in my riding, but the minister knows the situation very well. I am not asking that money be spent on these public works, therefore I feel in a pretty strong position to urge the minister to cut this vote down to what it was last year.

Mr. McGIVERIN: I understood the hon. member to say he had no objection to the extra vote of \$25,000 but that he wanted to ask something about soldier lands, which are not concerned in this vote. I may say that the city of Ottawa made out a very strong case for an increase of more than \$25,000 in the annual grant.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have no doubt.

Mr. McGIVERIN: Yes, and rightly so. Take, for instance, the growth in the last five years in connection with the fire brigade and in connection with properties in the city held by the government and on which the government does not pay taxes. This is the capital city of Canada, and when it comes to improving the city from the point of view of its being the capital that is provided for, and properly so, by the vote to the Ottawa Improvement Commission. No attempt was made to have that increased. But as to this vote the city proved that they were practically out of pocket in connection with it. I have nothing to say about the soldier lands; my colleague who is in charge of that department may speak about it. But that has nothing whatever to do with this city, and undoubtedly a case was made out for an increase of much more than \$25,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Of course the hon. member would be remiss in his duty if he did not support this vote, and it is just possible that if I represented Ottawa I might do the same thing, though I really do not think I would. When the minister turned down a request for certain public works in my riding I said I had no fault to find if he would follow the same principle throughout the whole of his

[Mr. Caldwell.]

estimates. That was in connection with a work that was needed very badly, and several other works in that part of Canada are needed just as badly. I am not urging that they be gone on with at the present time, and it will not get me any votes to say what I am saying now, but it is not necessary that I should get votes in that way. If it is, I do not want to be here. I think there has been too much of this sort of thing, too much of members coming with delegations before this government and urging increased expenditure, when we should be cutting down our expenditure instead of increasing it. That is a point I wish to make. I am not blaming the government so much; I think members of this House are possibly more to blame than the government, and I think the people back home are more to blame than the members are. I have no hesitation in saying that. Unless we have the courage of our convictions and say what we really believe to be the facts, I believe we are remiss in our duty, and while, as I said before, this will not get me any votes back home, I do not think that it is necessary that I should get them in this way. I am in earnest in this matter. If this sort of thing is to go on, how can we expect members of this House to forego pushing claims when they find other members of the House doing the same thing, backed up by delegations. I was very pleased to see my hon. friend made a minister without portfolio in this government, because I think he is a good man and all that kind of thing, but I am afraid these things are costing us too much. If because a man is a member of a government he can come here and get an increased grant for his city, I say that is wrong in principle, and I hope the government will not grant this increase. I urge them to cut it down.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time on division, and passed.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 160, to provide for further advances to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

Motion agreed to, on division, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.