

at any rate as far as my constituency is concerned, by saying that that remark does not apply to me. I think the Minister of Finance will search a long time before he will find any instance where I have asked to have money spent in my constituency.

The spokesman for the treasury is not acting in his usual manner. Everybody has been referring to him as a sort of watchdog, but evidently the dog has gone to sleep just lately. I do not think the Minister of Finance will take umbrage at those remarks. I have too high a regard for him to think that he would. As far as "watchdog" is concerned, I think I have heard him refer to himself in almost exactly those terms; and consequently he is not likely to take offence. I do not use the expression in any derogatory sense; I simply say that he has lost his vocation for the moment. An hon. member reminds me that he has not had much bite, but apparently the dog has lost his grip in respect of these things.

The Minister of Finance refers to the province of Ontario as having spent a lot of money on its government house, and he says; "Oh well, only a wealthy man can take the job, and somebody down there has made it popular." The person who held the position, the last occupant of the office, made it popular by spending his own money. That is one of the prerogatives of people who get these high positions. While they may set a good example to us and spend a lot of money, that is no earthly reason why in times like these we should go crazy, as if we were bitten by a dog and contracted rabies or something of that kind. I want to call the attention of the house to the difference between the minister's statement to-night regarding the expenditure at Rideau Hall, and what a return brought down the other day discloses. The Minister of Finance says we have not kept up these buildings, and yet the other minister here tells us that even during the years of the war we were spending on an average over \$50,000 a year on the upkeep of Rideau Hall.

Mr. MALCOLM: Oh no.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Oh yes, he does; and besides, I have under my hand a return which shows something entirely different. The Minister of Trade and Commerce may say no, but I want to—

Mr. MALCOLM: The Minister of Public Works said that about two-thirds of that vote was for salaries for the staff.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not think the minister will say that. I will sit down while the minister does say it.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Go on. We like to hear my hon. friend.

Mr. CHAPLIN: My hon. friend had better keep out of this. I have in my hand a return brought down only a short time ago, and according to it the upkeep and improvements at Rideau Hall during the past ten years were as follows:

Fiscal Year	Amount
1917-18..	\$ 75,579 49
1918-19..	59,994 72
1919-20..	61,985 46
1920-21..	69,981 38
1921-22..	81,906 12
1922-23..	94,425 12
1923-24..	94,426 64
1924-25..	96,067 42
1925-26..	99,344 34
1926-27..	128,560 72

My opinion is that sums of that size are very generous to keep in repair and to take care of depreciation of stone and ordinary brick buildings. That is a very large sum of money to lay out each year in the repair and upkeep of buildings. When the Minister of Finance tells us that we are asking for the expenditure of money, let me say to him that constituencies throughout the whole of Canada are in need of public services in the public interest and yet these moneys are being spent in folderols. That is all there is to it.

Mr. MANION: I have not taken very much part in the discussion to-day and I should like to say a word in regard to the statement made by the Minister of Finance as to those who ask for the expenditure of money in their constituencies. We should be living in a strange country if all the money that we collected and spent on public buildings and so forth should be spent in Ottawa. This year we have had immense sums spent in this city and at Rideau Hall and other places and that is what the party on this side of the house is protesting against. Certainly I as a member of parliament have no intention of sitting silent in the house and not asking for necessary expenditures, for example in my constituency. Most of the expenditures asked for in different constituencies by members in various parts of the house are asked for as expenditures which will bring in a return or which are necessary to provide postal customs or other facilities. I wish to put myself on record as taking the stand that simply because some member requests that necessary money be spent in his constituency for some particular work, that does not preclude him from standing up and protesting against what he considers to be unnecessary expenditures in Ottawa or elsewhere.

Amendment (Mr. Woodsworth) negatived.