

appreciate that, it being a money Bill, only those in another place have the right to add to or take from it. Every session for the last ten years a similar Bill has aroused criticism from the representatives of Ottawa. Right now my honourable friend to my left (Hon. Mr. Robinson) counters the complaint that the amount involved is inadequate for the civic services rendered to the federal authority by stating that maybe Moncton and other towns are entitled to some such consideration.

As I understand our leader, he told us that the \$100,000 is largely in payment for water used in Government buildings. If that is the case, perhaps more water is being used now than in former years, for the other day I was advised that I could use my lawn hose only on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and taxpayers on the east side of Bank street are allowed to water their gardens on three week-days and Sundays. This would indicate a water shortage. Of course we shall all be glad to comply with the regulations. But what does this water cost? In respect of my little home I pay \$34 for water alone, year in and year out. That means three homes similar to mine would pay more than \$100 a year and thirty homes upwards of \$1,000, and so on. During the past year or eighteen months a number of properties have been taken over by the Government for war purposes, and no longer will they be subject to city taxes. As a result those of us who are taxpayers will have to dig into our pockets and make good the deficit—and we shall not complain very strenuously.

It is only a question of ascertaining what is consistent and logical and what the Government should pay Ottawa for the civic services which it receives. During the past twelve years conditions have changed; undoubtedly in war-time they have changed materially; and it may be that in consequence the federal authorities should increase their payment to the City. Of course, we could not amend the Bill in this direction, even though we found that an increase would be equitable; but surely we can make a thorough inquiry into the matter. There is no hurry about the passage of this Bill. A few days ago we were looking for work, and I know many of us honestly desire it now. All right, let us refer this Bill to our Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce. Then we can have the officials of the City and of the Department of Public Works come before us with all the facts in relation to the question, so that we and those in another place will know whether in future \$100,000 is too much or too little. For these reasons I shall second

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK.

the motion of my honourable friend when he moves it after the Bill has been given second reading.

Hon. Mr. KING: Personally I see no great objection to the proposal. But this is a money Bill, and though a similar suggestion was made in the House of Commons, it was not accepted. The Minister stated that his department was engaged with the officials of the city of Ottawa in an attempt to arrive at what is fair compensation for the services rendered by the City to the federal authorities. Therefore I am inclined to think we should leave the matter with them, so that next session we shall have the benefit of their report for our guidance.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Carried.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: That would be just a repetition of what has happened for the last ten years.

Hon. Mr. KING: No; it would be for just one year.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: For ten years past we have followed pretty much the same course—always going to inquire into the merits, but never doing anything. Then along comes the annual Bill for \$100,000 payment to the City. This may be enough, but we ought to know whether it is or not. They are too busy in the other place to refer the Bill to a committee. We want an opportunity to work. All right, let this Bill be referred to our Banking and Commerce Committee, where we can get all the facts from the city fathers, the Public Works officials and everybody else concerned.

Hon. JOHN T. HAIG: I can see some reason in my honourable friend's argument. In Winnipeg we have a similar issue with our provincial Government. But the situation has become accentuated during the past two years on account of war conditions. It is manifestly unfair to ask the taxpayers of Ottawa to pay extra taxes for the benefit of the other taxpayers of Canada; for that is what it amounts to. True, this is a Government Bill, but, knowing human nature as I think I do, I can assure the honourable leader opposite that if this Bill were referred to our Banking and Commerce Committee, and the city officials of Ottawa were able to demonstrate to us beyond shadow of doubt that instead of paying \$100,000 the Government should pay \$150,000, the officials of the Department of Public Works would be eager to move a little faster in their negotiations with the City.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Hear, hear.