

for this specific public work which had not been used. This public building at Harriston is required for a post office and customs house. We have paid for the site to the town of Harriston \$2,556, to Matthew Hastey, \$450, and other travelling expenses, \$18.45, making \$3,018.45. The appropriation which we had during that session was \$5,000. Deducting that from the appropriation leaves \$1,981.55. There must be a misprint here as to the amount which lapsed, it should be \$1,981.55.

Mr. SPROULE. All these revotes were voted in one year, and lapsed. That confirms what I have often said when the estimates were being voted. That year I asked if it was seriously intended to go on with all these public works that year, and I was assured it was. I wanted to know if it was not intended to pad out the estimates preparatory to a general election, and if it was seriously intended that these public works would all be commenced that year. The very fact that we have so many of them on one sheet, all revotes, all for the same year, and now revived, rather seems to me to indicate that the government have possibly another general election in view. I would like to ask again if it is seriously intended that these votes shall be used the present year. It seems to me the system we are confronted with this year in the estimates indicates that we are padding out the list again, we are padding out the estimates again with many revotes that should not appear in them at all. There is no justification whatever for putting a vote in the estimates for any public work that is not intended to be gone on with during the present year, and I can hardly imagine that many of these will be taken up, because they are new works, during the present year. Although the money was voted in 1908 none of it has been spent up to the present time, but now it is intended to vote it again for 1910. I think that is a pernicious principle. If that is going to be the rule in future, why do you not give us the votes that lapsed twenty years ago as well as two, four, or five years, because there are many cases in which we have not spent the amount that has been voted? Why do you take up the votes that lapsed in 1908, and bring them into force while the votes passed in 1905 or 1906 do not appear at all? There is some purpose behind it, and the only purpose I can see is to provide for the possibility of a general election. It is a pernicious practice and should not be allowed, and we ought to have some better explanation of why it has been thought proper to change the established form that we have had heretofore and bring these votes in again. The money voted last year and not spent should appear in the revote column. All the money

not spent goes back into the consolidated revenue fund, and should remain there until voted again.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As my hon. friend has such a strong view upon this question I would have supposed that he would have expressed himself as being against the first item that we reached, and which was exactly similar to this. It was the item for Gananogue and when it was called my hon. friend called 'carried' at once.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member did not open his mouth in regard to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a revote of \$3,600, exactly the same as in this case. We took this amount in the session of 1908, but it was not expended. We are now asking for \$4,000, and for the information of the committee we show that \$3,600 is the amount which has lapsed. I will say to my hon. friend, and I am sure it will be very consoling for him, that as far as I am aware there is no danger of a general election in the near future. I have never heard anything of the kind, and my hon. friend need not be alarmed upon this subject at all.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a very innocent consolation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no doubt that it is a consoling thought to my hon. friend because I would expect that he would contemplate a general election with a good deal of fear and trembling.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the very reverse.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Harriston it is bona fide intended to go on with this work and we have placed this amount in the estimates for the present year. The reason that this building was not gone on with last year was that we used the small vote which we got for the purpose of purchasing a site. It was expected that at the last session we would ask for a larger amount to go on with the building, but in view of the declining revenues we asked the House to bear with us for another year and assist us in economizing. We did succeed in cutting down the estimates of the Public Works Department several millions of dollars, but in order to do it we had to let these public works stand over. Now that the revenues are reviving we have thought it only right that we should implement the assurances which were given to the House in 1908 when we asked for votes for these different public works. We intend to proceed with them during the present year.

Mr. SPROULE. At the time the estimates for the year were made up the revenue was showing a perceptible decline, it could have been as well foreseen when