

unexpended, because these are estimates for the year ending March 31, 1937, and they have already been included in the public works items. The money has already been voted once for that purpose by parliament. The auditor general has been making payments on the authority of the Public Works Construction Act, and these payments the Department of the Interior had placed at its disposal within the provisions of the act under an order in council by which certain sums of money were set aside for certain definite purposes. The money has been spent and cheques have been issued by the department. The auditor general is charging them up against the appropriation. I am asking how much of that money is left at this time.

Mr. CRERAR: Under the Public Works Construction Acts of 1934 and 1935, there was \$570,300 unexpended, \$168,000 under the 1934 act and \$402,300 under the 1935 act.

Mr. BENNETT: At what date?

Mr. CRERAR: March 31, 1936.

Mr. BENNETT: But since then, within the last two months, we have spent money on that account, and that is what I want to know about. Relief has been paid in the parks, to my knowledge, and likewise expenditures have been made on the administration building under contract at Banff and on buildings at other points.

Mr. CRERAR: The only thing paid subsequent to March 31 out of the votes under the Public Works Construction Acts of 1934 and 1935 are bills that were due by March 31 or progress estimates made at that time. The amounts necessary since then to complete these various projects already undertaken are in this vote. The decision was reached by the government, whether wisely or not, not to continue payments on these projects under the Public Works Construction Acts subsequent to March 31, 1936, and consequently it was necessary to include in these votes the amounts estimated to complete the various undertakings. That is the explanation of these items. With reference to the last two items, \$102,000 for relief of permanent residents of the parks, and \$50,000 for relief of single homeless men, to which my right hon. friend referred, these are largely estimates. The last item in the vote is to cover relief requirements for April and probably May. The other one is for the present fiscal year.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. BENNETT: It could not be the present fiscal year because these are projects already undertaken. The minister cannot say that there is a project already undertaken in connection with relief for the fiscal year beginning April, 1936, and ending March, 1937.

Mr. CRERAR: Technically, my right hon. friend may be quite right, but I am informed that the vote is to care for these relief requirements during the present fiscal year. I may say that I hope to get the relief costs in these parks down very substantially for the next winter season.

Mr. TAYLOR (Nanaimo): Has the minister anything to disclose in connection with the Ivy's Green area north of Ladysmith? At one time this was an Indian reservation, but there is no residence on it now and the Ladysmith people have petitioned to have this area made a park.

Mr. CRERAR: So far as I am aware there is before the parks branch no such request as that referred to by the hon. member.

Mr. TAYLOR (Nanaimo): For many years they have been using this area as a park, but commercial interests have been trying to secure it for oyster beds.

Mr. CRERAR: So far as I am aware no request has come into the parks branch for the establishment of a park in that area.

Mr. TAYLOR (Nanaimo): What would be the attitude of the minister should the people of Ladysmith ask that this be set aside as a park?

Mr. CRERAR: I think it would be scrutinized very carefully indeed.

Mr. TAYLOR (Nanaimo): Would a commercial application be scrutinized more carefully?

Mr. CRERAR: No, I would not say that it would.

Mr. BENNETT: I am very grateful to the minister for the clear explanation he gave in connection with item 320, but he will observe that that part of the actual vote of \$471,200 which is represented by progress estimates or certificates of expenditures made before March 31 must be deducted. I do not know whether he has these particulars before him, but it is obvious that the amount will thus be reduced. First of all the item is practically \$570,000; you expend \$100,000,