connection it is significant that Germany has decided to spend more money on public undertakings of a national character to do away with unemployment. I think this would be an equally sound course for Canada to take, for I believe if we appropriate funds for the erection of public buildings where they are really required, not only will the expenditure relieve unemployment, but it will help to build up our country as a whole. While the minister holds office—I am not sure how long that will be—

Some hon. MEMBERS: A long time.

Mr. McINTOSH: Well, whether short or long there is no question of the importance of being on the job in looking after the requirements of northern Saskatchewan, northern Alberta and northern Manitoba—

Some hon. MEMBERS: And northern British Columbia.

Mr. McINTOSH: Yes, and northern British Columbia, with respect to public buildings in order that the various federal services may be carried on efficiently and with proper consideration for the convenience of the public.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I beg to assure my hon. friend that in respect to northern British Columbia, northern Alberta, northern Saskatchewan, northern Manitoba, northern Ontario, northern Quebec, northern New Brunswick, northern Nova Scotia, northern Prince Edward Island—

Mr. McINTOSH: The whole north.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Right up to the north pole.

Mr. McINTOSH: That's the idea.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I agree with my hon. friend that if, standing here to-night, we could foresee just where unemployment is going to be acute next winter, and could appropriate public money to be spent in each particular place, we would be helping to relieve that impending condition. But, as he knows, we have to come to this house with a specific appropriation for a particular point, and that appropriation cannot be diverted to any other point, no matter how badly its expenditure is needed there, or how much more insistent the demand may be for it. The appropriation is earmarked and must be spent at the point specified. We have to be careful of the appropriations we ask for in view of the many demands that we are not able to meet. I think my hon. friend can recall an expenditure of about $25,000 that was made in his constituency last year. This was for an immigration hall, which now is not needed at all.

Mr. HANBURY: Sell it to Dominion City.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The mounted police are now asking permission to use it. So discretion must be exercised in making appropriations, and even using the best judgment mistakes may be made.

Mr. McKENZIE (Assiniboia): I do not notice in these estimates an item of $12,000 that last year was voted for a public building at Arcola, although the minister informed the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell) that there were one or two buildings that would not be proceeded with. Why has he discriminated against the town of Arcola? Arcola is a divisional point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the land titles office is located there, it is a judicial centre, and, in short, an important place. I quite appreciate what the hon. minister has said with regard to the necessity for economy, but this is only a small item of $12,000. And let me refer again to the estimates for Ontario. I notice for Thorold, there is an appropriation of $4,000 for a site for a public building. Why should the department be buying a site for a public building at Thorold when in Arcola the site has already been acquired and an appropriation made for the building in last year's estimates? Specifications were prepared and tenders called for the building. I should like the minister to tell me why the building was not proceeded with. Perhaps the minister will also inform me who objected to the proposed expenditure.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I did mention, in replying to the member for Melville, that the Arcola building was not being proceeded with. I can give my hon. friend a pretty good reason why. In the 1930-31 estimates there was an appropriation of $12,000 for the building. Tenders for construction were called for. The following tenders were received:

1. Bird, Woodall & Simpson, Ltd., Regina, $27,870.
2. Wilson & Wilson Ltd., Regina, $28,500.
3. Smith Bros. & Wilson, Ltd., Regina, $29,743.
4. A. O. Chiclens, Indian Head, $29,800.
5. Lockwood Bros., Regina, $30,173.
6. Poole Construction Company, Ltd., $30,200.
7. Macaw and MacDonald, Winnipeg, $30,617.40.
8. Weyburn Sash and Door Factory, Ltd., Regina, $31,328.80.
9. Hipperson Construction Company, Regina, $31,599.84.
10. W. H. McDiarmid, Regina, $32,887.
11. Broders Ltd., Regina, $33,000.

So there we were with an appropriation of only $12,000, upon which my hon. friend thinks we should have entered into an obligation to spend $27,870. With the revenues as I have stated, we did not feel ourselves warranted in incurring that obligation.