

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I think the hon. member from DeLanaudière (Hon. Mr. Casgrain) should explain the Bill. It was originally \$60,000 a year, but it is now \$100,000.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—I understand the city of Ottawa has represented that if the government property in the city were taxed the amount of taxes would be larger than this grant. Any one who has driven over the beautiful drives of the Improvement Commission must admit that the money has been well expended. The work has been done most economically. It would be well if all public money were as prudently and carefully expended.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—How much has been spent by the Improvement Commission up to date?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—A mere trifle, something over a million dollars.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Is the commission half through yet with its work?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—Very little remains to complete the boulevard.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read a second time.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Is the expenditure of the \$100,000 per annum beginning with 1909?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—The idea was to spend \$60,000 a year; but it was found it would take too long to make the improvements in that way, so the appropriation was discounted in order to prosecute the work more rapidly.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I thought the first grant to the city of Ottawa was \$120,000, but as it was an election time, the amount was reduced to \$60,000.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT—I was in the Commons at the time the Bill was introduced, and had a great deal to do with it at the time. The original Bill introduced in 1898

or 1899 was for \$60,000 per year for ten years, but in 1903, in order to enable the Improvement Commission to carry out the works then in contemplation, they were authorized to capitalize the grant of \$60,000, and the period of ten years was extended. This Bill provides that the grant shall be \$100,000 a year for ten years from 1909.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE—The appropriation is reasonable, taking into consideration the fact that the government do not pay taxes on their property. At the same time, I warn the government that in Quebec there is an immense amount of government property which is untaxed, and I understand the corporation of that city will ask for a grant similar to this, and I hope the government will accede to their request.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I may take this opportunity of congratulating the present party in power on their liberality and the progress they are making in spending money. These events revive one's memory. I remember distinctly, and so does my right hon. friend who sits opposite me, when the Conservative government took Major's Hill under their management and relieved the city of Ottawa of the responsibility of keeping that park in order, how we were jolly well abused by the Liberal party in the House of Commons. Although some years ago, they condemned the expenditure of a very small sum of money, they are now prepared to pay millions to beautify the city. I think the finances of Canada have developed sufficiently to justify to a great extent what has been done, but I cannot help contrasting the action of the Reform party of to-day with their conduct of a few years ago, when the attempt was made to put Major's Hill park in passable order.

The clause was adopted.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Is this amount provided in clause 17 for fire protection an additional sum to the \$40,000?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—Yes.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Making \$50,000?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—Yes.