

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister explain the item of \$57,000?

Mr. ROBB: That is for the maintenance of the storage dams on the Ottawa river to maintain the level of the waters during dry seasons.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Can the minister give us some information in regard to the next item of \$25,000, further amount required for the national monument on Connaught Place: when the work will be started, when it is estimated it may be completed, and how much it will cost?

Mr. DUNNING: The contract was let as a result of a world competition. The winner is now engaged on the monument in his studio at Farnborough, just out of London. The total cost will be in the neighbourhood of \$100,000. I am informed that it will take three years to complete the work.

Mr. GUTHRIE: When will the work of erection be started in Ottawa?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might say to my hon. friend that I had occasion to speak with the architect and the sculptor. The work is being executed by a family of the name of March whose members, five in number I think, have won many prizes in art competitions. They intimate that it will take three years before this monument can be completed, and that no work on Connaught Place can be done until the monument is ready to be put in place. In the meantime progress estimates have to be passed. Last summer the architects informed the government that the original sketch of the monument contemplated the figures being life size, but as it was to be placed in the open air they very strongly advised that the figures should be made heroic size instead. To do that meant a very considerable increase in the original cost but the government felt, after taking advice from expert sources, that it would be well to have the figures made heroic size, and that we could count on parliament voting the additional amount required to have the monument all that could be desired. This will probably occasion more in the way of cost and will perhaps take longer in execution.

Item agreed to.

To cover unprovided items, 1924-25, as per Auditor General's report, part A, page 2, 1924-25, \$1,995,649.79.

Mr. ROBB: Before six o'clock I was pointing out to my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) that this is the usual item that comes up every year. I have a memorandum of the vote each year covering a period of years.

[Mr. Dunning.]

This year the items included—I will not give the odd figures—are: Customs and excise, \$273,000; pensions \$716,000; post office \$716,000; soldiers' civil re-establishment \$234,000. In the following years the following amounts were voted as "unprovided items":

1918-19..	\$1,071,403.34
1919-20..	1,250,303.73
1920-21..	544,009.25
1921-22..	2,055,030.86
1922-23..	368,783.39
1923-24..	130,442.08

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why are these amounts not put in the main estimates or in the supplementary estimates? I confess I do not quite understand the system, although evidently it has prevailed for some time. Why should these different amounts be required each year to balance accounts?

Mr. ROBB: I am not quite sure that I am right about this, but I understand that they have drawn upon vote No. 1 to pay for vote No. 3, and so forth, and this is to legalize the procedure. There are overdrafts on the different departments.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In other words, they spend more money than parliament authorizes.

Mr. ROBB: Under a certain vote, but the total vote is there.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We are voting a lump sum to balance the account and that represents an amount of money not voted by parliament but which has been spent.

Mr. ROBB: I do not understand it that way, but I shall have that point carefully looked into.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is a matter of curiosity on my part, but it is a matter of consequence. We are asked to vote \$1,995,000 odd which is not voted in the main estimates or in the supplementary estimates; it is money which has not been voted by parliament. Is not that correct? We are now asked to ratify the expenditure by voting it.

Sir EUGENE Fiset: No, we are simply using a balance in respect of certain items to meet overdrafts in respect of others.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It does not seem to me that we are using a balance; we are authorizing an additional expenditure.

Sir EUGENE Fiset. This practice was followed during your regime.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have said that it has prevailed a long time.