

mentioned a moment ago they were able to reduce expenditure in the Interior department, for example, and certainly the government does not deserve any credit because they dismissed or fired from seven hundred to one thousand employees and thereby saved a great sum of money in the estimates. I will say, however, that they do deserve credit for reducing the estimates of the Minister of National Defence. I am only sorry that poor Roch Lanctot, one of the former members for Quebec, is not here to read the estimates and see that after all the years he fought to get the estimates of the Department of National Defence reduced, this is the first year that has happened.

Mr. GOTT: Believe it or not.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, believe it or not, but the fact remains that when all this talk that has gone out in the newspapers throughout the country, of a reduction of \$37,000,000 in the estimates, is boiled down it merely comes to this, that instead of reducing the estimates \$37,000,000 this government has not saved one dollar except at the expense of the country and by starving the various services. In other words, this government has been penny wise and pound foolish in reducing certain items.

Take for example the province of Nova Scotia. As I said a moment ago, some \$200,000 was unexpended last year, but that is not the worst of the picture. Not only was there \$200,000 unexpended last year, but what do we find in the main estimates this year, when the government has ten supporters from that province? Do we find as much money as was voted last year, when there were only three members supporting the government? We do not; we find a reduction of something like \$200,000 as compared with last year.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): Last year there was an election.

Mr. DUFF: That is quite right, and let me say to my hon. friend from Cape Breton, whom I helped get through this house a vote for the new Waterford post office, that not only in election years but in previous years there have been large expenditures in the maritime provinces. Take my own constituency, for example; during the four years from 1926 to 1930, when I represented Antigonish-Guysborough, I secured \$600,000 for those two counties. This year there is only \$2,100 in the estimates for Antigonish-Guysborough. This year, when we have ten members from Nova Scotia supporting the government, ten members who could go and no doubt went to the hon. member who repre-

sents an Ontario constituency, and who is Minister of Public Works, asking for more money to be spent in that province, there is \$200,000 less in the estimates than was the case last year.

And do not forget that most of the estimates appearing in this list to-day are not new moneys at all; they are either re-votes or expenditures in connection with repairs which it is impossible to avoid. I do not say it is because my hon. friends have no influence with the government; I do not know what the reason is. But I hope that when the supplementary estimates come down every hon. member supporting the government on the opposite side from Nova Scotia will see that, instead of this condition of affairs which we have to-day, there will be a decent vote for each of the different counties of Nova Scotia.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): If I sent another sheet of figures across to my hon. friend I suppose he would be able to prove that there had been no expenditures anywhere in Canada. He was speaking about Nova Scotia, Ontario and Quebec in relation to harbours and rivers, and he complained that in the province of Quebec there had been unexpended the sum of \$606,600 on harbours and rivers. If he will go to Ontario he will find that the amount unexpended is larger than that—\$731,643.20. He did not make that comparison.

Mr. POWER: The amount voted was nearly a million larger.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes, but the proportion is about the same.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes, approximately the same.

Mr. DUFF: The figures the minister gave me are wrong, then.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): No, they are not wrong. Now, my hon. friend was speaking about the excuse for not expending the moneys. We are not looking for excuses; we are giving the reasons—perfectly good reasons. As my hon. friend knows, these expenditures are made from revenues, and the revenues declined. But let me suggest that in the prior years to which he referred, when the revenues were not declining, when in fact they were abundant, there was no excuse for the failure of the government to expend a larger sum than we failed to expend in the last year. Then he speaks about Nova Scotia and complains that the expenditure there this year is not as large as it should be. Well, he cannot charge this on political grounds, surely. With the