

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but it is put in differently. My hon. friend will see that the effect of putting it in that way is to reduce his increase of expenditure from \$364,350 down to \$191,000. I cannot for the life of me see why my hon. friend should have put in that \$173,000, and then have used those figures in order to show that the actual ordinary expenditure this year is not as the figures show, some \$350,000 odd dollars more than was the ordinary expenditure last year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am doing simply what the ex-Minister of Public Works did in his own department again and again. The Auditor General requires it to be so published.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to know from the minister, if it would not be giving away any military secrets, whether he is placing any new guns in the batteries in the Citadel at Halifax.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If the hon. gentleman would be good enough to come to the department I will show him all the details in connection with the matter. I can say, however, that I have not given any order for any guns at Halifax.

Mr. McKENZIE. For the security of this country we ought to have the very best guns placed in those batteries, and if they are not there now they should be put there and no criticism will be offered from this side.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to come down to the department I will be glad to show him what is proposed in regard to Halifax.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister says that there appears in the estimates of the Department of Public Works an amount which was utilized the previous year for some special purpose, and for which there was not a similar appropriation in the current year, and it was used in order to show a decrease. That is not the case. If my hon. friend will take the estimates for this year of the Department of Public Works he will find that although the appropriation is not required, or added in the column of the previous year, yet the alleged decrease is not shown in any of the columns. Neither is it shown in the estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals. I do not know if it is shown in the estimates of any other department, but it seems to be specially shown in the Department of Militia and Defence, and my hon. friend will see that it conveys an entirely erroneous impression. It is calculated to give the idea to the House and to the country that there has only been an increase of \$191,000 upon the ordinary

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

militia expenditure, whereas the hon. gentleman knows the increase is \$364,350.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the hon. gentlemen tell the House that every time the estimates for the Department of Public Works were prepared, they were not prepared in the way I state? If he does he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I stated that the amount did appear, but it is not carried out into a column showing decreases.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Neither is this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will look at the militia items on page 48 he will see that the appropriations not required for 1912-13 are carried out to a special column under the heading of decrease, and that amount is added in, in order to show a decrease. You do not find that in the estimates of the Public Works Department, or in the estimates for the Railways and Canals Department, and I doubt whether you will find it in any other department. It is only the Militia Department that has adopted that plan. Why has there been a different rule followed in regard to the Militia Department from what has been adopted in the case of the other departments referred to?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). On all matters we find a decrease for 1912-13 in the Public Works estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but you do not find the amount carried into a column as showing a decrease. If my hon. friend looks at it he will see the difference.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not see any difference whatever.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If he had left that out of the column showing a decrease, the actual increase upon the ordinary expenditure would be \$364,350, whereas it is shown in this column as being only \$191,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will my hon. friend explain how we could add up the estimates for 1911-12, and make it \$8,121,850, and subtract from \$8,312,850, the appropriations required for 1912-13, without getting anything else than \$191,000. That was done in the case of the Public Works estimates last year, and the same thing was done in every estimate that was ever brought down. The point the hon. gentleman is making, is not well taken. All he has to do is to subtract the total estimates of one year from the total estimate of the previous year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman will turn to Public Works of Ontario, he will find in the column of 1911-12, the ap-