

Mr. SPENCER: Before this item carries I should like some further information from the minister. The two items of \$50,000 and \$60,000 that we are discussing to-night amount to \$110,000 and the minister has given us details in regard to amounts of \$45,000 and \$16,000, or a total of \$61,000. It seems only reasonable that we should ask and expect to receive answers as to how the balance is going to be applied. Surely where repairs and changes are being made in such an important building as Rideau Hall, plans should be made well in advance, and I cannot understand why the minister is unable to give us particulars how the money is going to be spent. Going back into past history we find that from time to time royalty has been extravagant and that parliament has had to step in and criticize the expenditure of kings. In this case we have in Canada a representative of His Majesty who, in the opinion of many members, is getting a little too extravagant for the welfare of this country. It is a very unpleasant duty, I admit, but it is our duty to draw the attention of the government, who ask us to vote for these items, to the fact that we consider these things are too expensive.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend think his question is fair? If he had paid attention to what I told him a moment ago, I stated that the \$60,000 item was taken up with wages of the thirty-five servants amounting to more than \$45,000, and materials used by them in connection with the various services there, amounting to about \$15,000. That covers the \$60,000. That leaves \$50,000, of which I have given my hon. friend the details.

Mr. SPENCER: For \$16,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, and I have told him that the balance was made up in furnishings required from time to time, improvements and repairs.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Is it the intention to build any addition to any of the buildings and, if so, has the minister the architect's plan so that he can tell us what is going to be done?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The only addition that is proposed is a tennis pavilion amounting to \$10,000. May I call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that if the \$65,000 item that was thought necessary and that was expended in 1914 had been followed right through, instead of what has been expended annually since that time in this particular connection, it would have made up \$120,000 of the \$150,000 that we spent the year before last,

[Mr. Manion.]

this last year and that we are asking for now. This is practically to make up the deficiency for those years. I would suggest, if I might, that the item of \$60,000 appearing on page 33, and having a direct relation to the matter we have just been considering, be now discussed while we have the whole matter in mind.

Mr. SPENCER: This item has not been carried yet and the minister has already given us the particulars that make up the \$60,000 item. The particulars we want are in connection with the \$50,000 item. He has not given them to us; he has given us details covering only \$16,000 and I am going to give him a wide margin. I beg to move:

That item 127: Ottawa, Rideau Hall alterations, improvements and furnishings, be reduced by \$20,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not see any advantage in repetition. I have already given my hon. friend all the information I have on the subject, all the information that is available at the present moment. I have given him details as to the fencing, the decorations, bathrooms, carpets, glassware, and so forth, and it is the opinion of the architect who has looked over the grounds and buildings that it will be necessary to provide certain new furnishings and repairs, of which he cannot give definite details at the present time, but they will be required in the present year.

Mr. GARDINER: If the minister is so satisfied that they will be required, why cannot he give the details?

Mr. ELLIOTT: They are general repairs.

Mr. GARDINER: That is not a reasonable answer. If the architect thinks that they will be required, he should give some information as to what is required, and what will be the cost. I would remind the minister again that he has only given an explanation with regard to items totalling \$16,000. The amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Battle River is to reduce the item by \$20,000, so there will still be a margin left of \$14,000. Does not the minister think that would be sufficient for the additional requirements, especially in view of the fact that the architect is not in a position to give any details as to what the balance is required for?

Amendment (Mr. Spencer) negatived.

Item agreed to.

Rideau Hall, including grounds—improvements, furniture, maintenance, etc., \$60,000.

Miss MACPHAIL: I do not think it is the desire of any member of this house to seem