

the contractors could have gone on and we would have had to pay them either by a supplementary estimate, as we did, or by a main estimate. Following the discussion of this matter some time ago I found that the late government sometimes followed that practice, and I do not criticize them for it. In connection with the Hudson Bay railway, at one time the contractors over-spent \$1,700,000, which was not paid until the following year, exactly as we did in connection with the Welland canal. So it will be seen that this was in a different position from the matter to which my hon. friend has referred. We had the contract, and if the work had not been authorized it would have meant closing down all these activities. The work was on a unit basis, so we had practically no control over it.

May I point out another fact which the Minister of Public Works probably has pointed out, though I have not heard him do so today. The question has come up very often as to whether it would have been wiser for the Department of Public Works to go on and do a certain work or, in another way, use part of the \$20,000,000 unemployment fund voted at the last session of parliament. It is worth remembering that if the Department of Public Works carries on a piece of work, we will say a \$1,000,000 contract, the \$1,000,000 is spent and in some cases it gives a good deal of employment. In other cases, however, it does not give so much employment. In dredging contracts, for example, it does not mean much in the way of employment, but in any event only \$1,000,000 is spent. Under the \$20,000,000 contract, the spending of \$1,000,000 by the Dominion government brought about the expenditure of \$3,000,000 in all, because the province added \$1,000,000 and the municipality another \$1,000,000. There was this added advantage, that the municipality which required assistance asked for it, because it had a lot of unemployment, and it undertook some public works such as sewers or sidewalks and contributed part of the cost, the balance being contributed by the province and the Dominion government, so there was a larger amount of work going on and a larger amount of money spent in the sections of the country needing unemployment relief, if they were willing to go forward and do their share, than otherwise might have been the case.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am very glad the minister has given that explanation. When I went back home at Easter the newspapers had advertised the fact that \$2,000,000 had been voted by parliament for the Welland canal.

[Mr. Manion.]

Some of the people seemed to be under the impression that this \$2,000,000 was voted while other public works, the money for which had been voted previously, had not been carried forward. I think that is a bad impression to have going throughout the country, because the people feel they are being discriminated against and I do not blame them, because they do not know all the details. The only difference between the project about which I am talking, this small building in Dominion City, and the Welland canal, is that the people engaged on the Welland canal were already employed and were about to be thrown out of employment if this money had not been spent, while in the other case the people were already unemployed. That is the only difference.

Mr. MANION: Except that the municipality could have come forward and secured assistance for the construction of public works, in cooperation with the province and the Dominion.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I quite understand that, and this municipality did take a certain percentage of that relief fund, and had to make their own contribution to that work. They said to me, "An amount was voted by parliament and placed in the estimates for the construction of certain buildings here. Why should we have to borrow money to work in conjunction with this relief fund when there is public money already voted by the parliament of Canada?" Parliament at the special session voted \$20,000,000 for unemployment. I do not object to that, but at the same time this amount was voted at the regular session and should have been expended. Most of these municipalities went into debt in order to take care of their unemployed under the \$20,000,000 fund, in conjunction with the province and the Dominion government, while this money was voted and was not expended. Tenders had been called for; contracts were about ready to be let; plans and specifications were prepared, but nothing was done. There is a wrong impression among the people, and I think perhaps this discussion will clear it up in my riding at all events. However, the situation remains; money was voted by parliament during the regular session and was not expended, to the extent of \$164,000 in Manitoba, yet we came back for the special session and voted still more money, which to my mind looks ridiculous.

Mr. HEAPS: These being Manitoba estimates, I wish to say a word or two. The Minister of Public Works has just made the statement that he is opposed to the erection