

the money which it cost any day in the year, will be there ready to take care of settlers going in to open up that vast northern hinterland, which will not only build up western Canada and start the flow of settlement northward in the western provinces, but which will also help to build up the entire country.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): In answer to my hon. friend I wish to make it perfectly clear that I was not criticizing the construction of that building. I was simply pointing to it as an example of an expenditure of public money which, through a change of circumstances, is temporarily at least rendered unproductive and practically of no value. I do want to point out to my hon. friend, however, that while this building and the others he mentioned were being constructed, speeches were being delivered in this house against increased immigration into the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. I have heard hon. members get up one after another and say, "We do not need any more immigration; it should be restricted and curtailed," and I am sure my hon. friend will recall those speeches also.

Mr. HANBURY: Does the minister suggest that this is the policy of the present Prime Minister?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I have no announcement to make with regard to the immigration policy of this government; that will come through the regular channels.

Mr. HANBURY: The minister says speeches were made against immigration at that time. Does he say that was the policy of the present Prime Minister at that time?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I have no statement to make in that connection.

Mr. DONNELLY: We all fully realize that there is great necessity for economy in Canada to-day because of our falling revenues, and I fully appreciate the position of the minister when he expresses the need for that economy. I do not wish to criticize the department in any way for the steps which have been taken along these lines. We must all fully realize also the great necessity for relieving unemployment, and the expenditure of \$12,000 in connection with this building in Arcola, to which reference has been made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. McKenzie), would have helped to relieve unemployment in that district. There is no doubt that unemployment is more rampant in the west than anywhere else, and when the minister draws

the line and says he cannot spend this money because it would probably mean the expenditure of \$15,000 more, I would direct his attention to other places where, apparently forgetting economy, he is spending a good deal more. Take Fort William, for instance: we have an estimate of \$50,000 there for a site for a public building. How much unemployment will that relieve? How many people will that put to work? The government is only buying land there, spending \$50,000 for the purpose. Turn again to Thorold—\$4,000 for a site there. To how many people will that give employment? Then look at Belleville; there we have an expenditure of \$20,000, right in Ontario, just for a site or an addition to a site. I do not know how much land is going to be acquired, but it does not seem to be consistent that the government should spend money in these places where buildings are not going to be erected immediately, and neglect other places where construction could be proceeded with at once.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Circumstances differ. There are times when it is good economy to buy land even if you are not going to use it for some time. I think my hon. friend will agree with that. As to Arcola, I can only say that, with falling revenues and a very much larger expenditure than was provided for in the estimates, we did not feel warranted in proceeding.

Mr. McKENZIE (Assiniboia): Regarding the minister's statement that the expenditures are larger than were anticipated, I do not think that is right. I know that last year the Minister of Public Works did not anticipate that \$12,000 would complete the building, but it was considered that that was all it would be possible to spend that year, because it was August before the tenders were called for and \$12,000 was all it was felt could be expended for the time being. The minister says further that the revenues do not warrant this expenditure. I should like to have a comparison—not that I am going to object to any other expenditures that have been made—between the revenues, on the one hand, in the town of Deloraine, Manitoba, where there has been an expenditure already of \$33,000—we do not know whether that will complete the contract—and Watrous, in Saskatchewan, where \$50,000 has been spent, and, on the other hand, the revenues derived from Arcola. There is being spent in Watrous twice as much as we think would put up a proper building in Arcola. Does the revenue in Watrous warrant an expenditure of \$50,000, which probably by the time the building is completed will increase to \$60,000?