

and I think some further explanation should be made as to why the item has been held over and an attempt made to get it through Parliament at the present time. It is more particularly desirable to hold the item over because the hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) who, when minister, incurred the expenditure is not now a member of the Government and not now in his seat. If he were here he would probably be in a position to give information which the hon. the Minister of Militia is not able to give this evening. I think it is very desirable that we should obtain more information, and, obtain it, if possible, from the ex-Minister of Militia himself.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Hansard is full of explanations in regard to this particular matter. Question after question has been asked, and the item has been in the Estimates year in and year out.

Mr. KYTE: No estimate for this item.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The ex-Minister of Militia has made an explanation in regard to it, and I think the hon. gentleman is raising more serious objection now than previously. The matter has been threshed out in the House, the Estimates have been passed each year, and questions have been asked. Questions were asked on February 16, 1914, and the matter has been the subject of many discussions, but no protest so severe in its character as the one my hon. friend now makes was ever made.

Mr. KYTE: We would like to know what was the exact expenditure incurred by the predecessor of the ex-Minister of Militia. The hon. minister has not that information. He has read a statement made in the House by the ex-Minister of Militia. While I am not questioning that explanation, I think that under the circumstances he should have the exact amounts from the Militia Department to compare with the expenditure incurred in 1914 for this particular service.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: There is nothing new about this matter. As I read a few moments ago, the expenditure in 1907-8 of a similar character was \$26,772.

Mr. OLIVER: Is that for the two years?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: That is for the fiscal year 1907-8. In 1908-9 the expenditure was \$32,601.

Mr. KYTE: It is quite possible the last item given by the hon. minister in 1907-8 includes items other than those included in

[Mr. Kyte.]

the item we are asked to vote this evening. In order that a proper comparison may be made between this expenditure and the expenditure by Sir Frederick Borden for this service, we should know absolutely whether the items correspond or not.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I do not know, I am sure, that the items would absolutely correspond. I am satisfied these officers were just as economical in the expenditure of money as the officers were on any previous trips. I think my hon. friend should permit the item to pass, because the money has been spent, and the item has passed the Treasury Board and has been placed in the Estimates. Moreover, the matter has been up every year since the occasion referred to. The pages of Hansard have been filled with the discussion of it, but no such severe criticism was made as has been made to-night.

Mr. KYTE: The fact that the pages of Hansard were covered with discussion of this item from year to year since 1913 goes to show that there was something extraordinary about it. If the item were the same as, or similar to the one placed in the Estimates by the late Sir Frederick Borden, Hansard would not be filled with criticism of the expenditure; there would not be repeated inquiries for information. The reason given by the minister for allowing the item to pass is a reason why it should not pass until we have more detailed information.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The minister has stated that certain military advantages were obtained by the presence of the officers at these manoeuvres in Switzerland in 1913. That may be correct, but certain disadvantages resulted from this expedition. The ex-Minister of Militia stated that it was at these manoeuvres that Miss McAdam conceived the idea of the shovel. This brought upon the country an expenditure of some \$40,000, and, so far as we can learn, no advantage, military or otherwise, ever resulted. What became of these shovels is not very clear; the minister himself does not seem to know. That is another reason why the item should stand until the minister obtains further information.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: This item has nothing to do with the shovels.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The ex-minister stated that the shovel idea was the result of these manoeuvres; the two matters, therefore are very closely connected. It would