

the pay of officers who are with the British navy, for ordnance stores, technical stores which we get from them and which we cannot get in Canada, for ammunition, for ships' articles and for instructional supplies. This is for the purpose of squaring our accounts with the admiralty. They made a request that the account be straightened out, and this amount is for that purpose.

Item agreed to.

Air service—Canadian air force—further amount required to meet the demand from other government departments for extensions in civil operations, \$398,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is one point I would like to bring out; this amount is for the requirements of other departments of the government. Why should not that be charged to those departments? It makes the air service vote very large, and the air service gets no benefit from this amount while the people are sometimes inclined to criticise such expenditures. I would suggest that the other departments requiring these services pay for them, and the amounts be charged to them, which seems to me a fair proposition.

Mr. ROBB: We will take that into consideration.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): May I point out that this is something of which a good many will approve, as one way of increasing the air force. I am strongly in favour of it; the air force is a branch on which the government should spend much more money.

Mr. LANCTOT: They are spending too much on it already.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I say that my learned friend's suggestion was followed particularly in connection with the fire patrol work for a year or two, but it is not pleasing to have to vote a sum of money over which you have no control. We have two services, the aerial photography service, which is so valuable from the standpoint of a surveyor, and the fire patrol service, both carried on by the Department of National Defence, and we are in the position of passing accounts of which we knew nothing. Therefore we adopted the principle of putting the whole vote in the air force, they being responsible for it, and giving an estimate of what the requirements were.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—to compensate Chairman W. C. Shelly, Vancouver parks board, \$15,500.

Mr. SPENCER: Will the minister explain?

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. RALSTON: I was about to explain, Mr. Chairman, that this estimate is to repay to the chairman of the Vancouver parks board an amount which he expended in order to pay off a claim of a dispossessed squatter. Vancouver park, I understand,—

Mr. LADNER: Stanley park.

Mr. RALSTON: Stanley park is owned by the government and there were a large number of squatters, one of whom established a prescriptive right. The chairman of the parks board paid off this amount which is proposed to be repaid by the government.

Mr. ERNST: Was the amount awarded by a tribunal, or is it simply a compromise settlement?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry but I cannot give that information. A prescriptive right was established, but I cannot tell my hon. friend how the assessment was arrived at.

Mr. LADNER: If I might make a statement I would say that this action became necessary as a result, as the minister has said, of a prescriptive right being established by one squatter out of a number. Some of these cases went to the Supreme Court of Canada, and I think even to the Privy Council. The parks board wished to preserve this essential property for the purposes of Stanley park, and they were on the eve of losing it. Some speculators desired to take the property over, and were about to offer an amount to the squatter when the parks board stepped in and saved the property to the public.

Mr. BROWN: Was that particular case a test case for the others?

Mr. LADNER: The other cases had been tried and this particular case succeeded.

Mr. ADSHEAD: What was the size of the property?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry but I do not happen to have that information before me.

Item agreed to.

Imperial War Graves Commission—further amount required to meet Canada's share of expenditures and contribution to endowment fund to March 31, 1926, \$237,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Would the minister be good enough to give an explanation with respect to the endowment fund. There is an endowment fund provided for, but I understand this is a larger amount than usual and I should like the minister to explain it.

Mr. RALSTON: As I understand it, this amount of \$237,000 is for the purpose of bringing our contribution to what is called the