

penditures is \$332,962. When I refer to the estimates I find at the bottom of the column the words "appropriations not required," and the amount is \$539,450. Will the minister kindly explain the difference in those figures?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): These are cases where votes are made for a certain amount and it is found that the full amount is not required or is not expended, and it lapses.

Mr. DONNELLY: But why the difference in the figures? These two sets of figures refer to the same thing, so why should there be a difference of \$200,000?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): That is a matter covering a great many details and a great many cases.

Mr. DONNELLY: I cannot see the reason for the difference. Here we have a list of the appropriations and expenditures, the difference being that part of the appropriations which was not required, which is given as some \$332,000. In the other case the amount of \$539,000 is given for the same thing. Why should there be any difference?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): If my hon. friend would ask for any particular appropriation I could give him the details and the amount.

Mr. DONNELLY: You give us the whole list here, under vote 186 covering Ontario, and at the bottom you say, "appropriations not required, \$539,450." Now I take up this statement which was handed us and I find that under vote 186, for the province of Ontario, \$2,616,323.95 was appropriated, of which we are told \$2,283,361.92 was expended, leaving a difference of approximately \$332,000. I am asking only for the reason for the difference between the two sets of figures.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The difference arises from several causes. In some cases the work is started and not completed, while in others the amount required is less than the amount voted, and the difference lapses.

Mr. DONNELLY: I fully realize that, but I am asking the reason for the difference between these two sets of figures, which are for the same year and are supposed to cover the same thing.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It is not the same thing, the difference being that we have an appropriation one year and we complete the work the following year.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Looking over the estimates for public buildings in Ontario I see the town of Wallaceburg has been overlooked. Last session \$20,000 was voted for a public building at this point and tenders

[Mr. Donnelly.]

were called for last September. There is no doubt that Wallaceburg had its share of unemployment, and I think it would have been of great advantage to the town if work had been proceeded with in connection with that building. I should like to know why nothing has been done and why there is nothing in the estimates this year for this building.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The plans for this building were prepared by an outside architect.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Pardon me, but the plans were prepared by an architect in Chatham, not an architect outside the county of Kent.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I meant an architect outside the department; the plans were prepared by a local architect. There was some more or less serious objection raised to the plans after the matter was submitted for consideration, and further representations were made to the effect that the building was not adequate, so other plans had to be prepared.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: I understand that the people of Wallaceburg were perfectly satisfied with the plans, but that apparently when the tenders were opened they were not satisfied with the man who was supposed to receive the contract. Then certain objections were raised to the plans; they wanted two doors instead of one, which was simply an excuse to delay the construction of the building. I should like to know why that construction was not proceeded with.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The objections to the plan were very much more extensive than my hon. friend suggests. With reference to the contractor I can only say that it is the policy of the Department of Public Works to accept the lowest tender, and that policy is rigidly adhered to.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Why was not the lowest tender accepted?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I have given my hon. friend the reasons; it was because of certain objections to the plans. It was suggested that there should be radical changes made in the construction of the building.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Then after those radical changes were made why was not an appropriation put in the estimates for this year?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): A great many demands have been made for the inclusion of amounts in the estimates to provide for public buildings. We have not been able to meet all those demands this year.