

number of representatives we have from the province of Nova Scotia, it is apparent that there is no attempt to make expenditures on political grounds. He must agree with that.

Mr. DUFF: I certainly agree that the lack of expenditures is not on political grounds; I certainly agree with that. I am sorry the minister did not understand me. What I said was that there are certain reasons why a few people in Ontario do not appreciate the importance of Nova Scotia, and I am afraid the Minister of Public Works is one of those people. I said I thought that some people in Ontario had an inferiority complex. Now is that plain enough?

An hon. MEMBER: A superiority complex.

Mr. DUFF: No, inferiority. Get that straight. Then my hon. friend says that the reason why he did not spend this money last year was that the revenues decreased. The hon. gentleman evidently does not know enough about business to realize that when the Liberal party went out of power last year they left a surplus of some eighty million dollars in the treasury. The money which went to make up the estimates of last year was voted out of money that was in the treasury at the time, before we went out of power; consequently my hon. friend has no right to make the statement that he did not spend the money because the revenues were not sufficient. It is true that as soon as the Tory party got into power a blight came over the country. Providence has never favoured the Tory party ever since I can remember. As soon as the Tory party has come into power, whether from 1878 to 1896, or from 1911 to 1921, this country has gone to the dogs. The only time the country was prosperous was when the Liberal party was in power. My hon. friend surely could not say that when we left them in 1911 with a surplus of \$37,000,000, and in 1930 with a surplus of \$80,000,000, that was the reason he did not expend the money. That will not go down with any man who has any business sense at all and who understands the financial condition of this country. There is no reason why the money was not expended except that my hon. friend did not want to spend it. It was voted by a Liberal government, and he said, "I presume it was to be spent in Liberal constituencies, or constituencies represented by Liberals," and so he would see that the money was not expended. He would do that to teach the electorate a lesson. I notice in the estimates that there is only \$2,100 for my constituency. I am quite satisfied; it shows the difference between the Tory candidate in the county and myself.

[Mr. H. A. Stewart.]

Mr. EULER: I note that the total estimate for Ontario is reduced almost 50 per cent. Unlike my hon. friend from Nova Scotia, I will find no fault with that, even if there is nothing whatever for the constituency I represent; we did not ask for anything. I would ask the minister, however, to give some explanation with regard to some of the larger items. Take the first item, Belleville public building, addition to site, \$20,000. Does this mean that a site is purchased contiguous to the public building there, and is it the intention to erect another building or an addition to a public building at present on that site?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The proposition is to acquire some additional land adjacent to the post office in the city of Belleville for needed extensions.

Mr. EULER: Which will be in the estimates in the succeeding year.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes.

Mr. EULER: Does the department consider it a good practice to purchase a site, leave it vacant, expend money and not erect the building at about the same time?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It is a good practice to purchase a site when it is in the market at a good price, and the conditions in Belleville in that respect are peculiar at this time. If the property is not secured in the near future, it will probably be lost and will have to be expropriated or acquired at a much greater cost.

Mr. EULER: One hears at times of sites being purchased. I have in mind one in the constituency of Prince Rupert purchased some years ago at a cost of some \$100,000. Some \$20,000 was spent in digging a basement out of solid rock, and the property has never been made use of since; it is still there. I want to caution the minister against that practice. I wish to ask for some explanation of what appear to be new public buildings in some of the towns and cities in Ontario. Take, for instance, the following: Fort William, \$50,000 for a public building—perhaps I should say the city of Fort William in deference to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Manion). Then Guelph, \$50,000; New Liskeard, \$61,000; Penetanguishene, \$57,000; Stratford, \$41,000. Are these new buildings, and what is the purpose of the appropriation?