

these expenditures were made. As is now pretty generally understood, they were made in cooperation with the provinces and the municipalities. In that way a larger sum was secured for the relief of unemployment than could have been provided through the expenditures of the whole \$20,000,000 on public works. If any different policy from that suggested was adopted, it was because circumstances fully warranted the change, and because the policy finally adopted was better in the public interest, and, as was calculated, has resulted in giving a very much larger measure of relief to unemployment than could have been possible by the method referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. VENIOT: May I ask the minister if the amount voted in the winter session of 1930 had been expended, would not that have increased the amount provided for unemployment? Did not the Prime Minister by his statement in September give the house and the country to understand that if the money voted in the winter session of 1930 had not been voted, it would have been necessary to vote even more than \$20,000,000 for unemployment relief? That is the point which I wish cleared up. We voted the money in 1930 for certain public works. At the time we were discussing in the house the unemployment situation, and the intention of the government of that day in voting the money was to carry on as rapidly as possible the proposed public works to provide employment. The general election takes place, the government of the day is defeated, a new government comes into power, a special session is called in September, and in order to relieve the unemployment situation the Prime Minister states to this house that in addition to the money already voted by parliament it is necessary to vote \$20,000,000. That having been done, why hold back the expenditure of the \$20,000,000 and give as a reason, as the minister himself has given with respect to certain cases in my county, that the holding back was in consequence of lack of revenue? It was clearly pointed out to the minister by myself personally, and by various letters that he received, that the situation existing in that county was such that the people were practically on the verge of starvation. The necessary expenditure had been authorized by parliament, tenders had been called for, the minister himself recommending that the lowest tender be accepted at a figure of \$6,000 less than the cost of the work as estimated by the engineers of the department. After receiving appeal upon appeal the minister's heart was softened, he went to council to recommend

that this work be carried out. Yet in the face of those appeals and of the recommendation of the minister himself—I give him credit for his change of heart—the necessary work was cancelled and the people were left almost on the verge of starvation. All that was expended in that district out of the share of the \$20,000,000 allotted to New Brunswick—expended on the recommendation of the provincial government—was the small sum of between \$250 and \$300. Now, I take it that in the winter of 1930 money having been voted for these public works, the present Prime Minister having stood up in this house in September and said that in addition to all that money it was necessary to vote \$20,000,000 to relieve unemployment, surely there was no reason why these public works should not have been proceeded with even in the middle of winter.

Mr. BERTRAND: I notice an item for alterations to fittings in the public building at Hawkesbury. What is the nature of the alterations?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): This is an item of \$1,500 to provide for alterations to the screen and fittings in the post office at Hawkesbury, as requested by the deputy postmaster general.

Mr. VENIOT: It is quite necessary.

Mr. BERTRAND: I wonder if the minister is aware that this was an extension to the post office building in Hawkesbury and consequently there will need to be some alteration of the fittings. When these alterations are made it will be necessary to have a regular cleaning up of the post office, including new paint, because it looks very bad at the present time. I quite approve of the alterations which are to be made and I would ask the minister to have this building cleaned up. I was in the cellar of that building recently, and from the top to the cellar it is in a very bad state. It should be cleaned up in the interests of public health and for many other reasons. I hope the minister will give this question his kind consideration.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I can only say to my hon. friend that expenditures of this kind are made from the general fund for maintenance of buildings. The condition of this post office will be investigated and needed repairs will be made.

Mr. DONNELLY: In this list of appropriations and expenditures with which the minister has furnished us for 1930-31, referring to vote 186 for Ontario, I see that the difference between the appropriations and the ex-