

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is what I thought it was for. I was wondering if the government intends to finish the post office building. Reference to the contract and to the files and plans will indicate that provision was made for a tower clock. The building is finished except for that tower clock, which will involve a separate contract in itself, just as separate contracts are made for fixtures for the building. We are very proud of this building. It is a very creditable building for the purpose for which it was erected, but we do not like to see those three vacant places where the clock should be. If the clock is not put in, provision will have to be made for boarding up the opening to keep the weather out. I understand that the cost of the clock would be approximately \$1,000. It may be said that in these hard times we should not spend \$1,000 on a clock. Well, in that case, something else will have to be done to keep the weather out, and the new government will be advertised as not finishing a building that was started by the former government. I know that my hon. friend the minister does not want to be put in that position. The people of that thriving town are very desirous of having the work finished. If the minister will consult with his deputy he will find that the original plans called for a clock, and I feel satisfied that he will carry out the original plans.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The construction of this building has just been finished. Provision has been made for a clock, as the hon. gentleman said. This government desires to be up to the minute and on time—

An hon. MEMBER: Daylight saving.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes, and every other kind of saving, but notwithstanding that, we shall endeavour to provide a clock for the hon. gentleman's building.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is no provision for it in these estimates that I can see.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It can come out of the general vote if circumstances permit. We will take it into consideration.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Thank you. I will report that to the mayor and residents of the town of Melville.

With reference to the item "Appropriations not required for 1931-32," I notice that the amount being spent in Saskatchewan for public buildings this year is only one-sixth of what was spent last year, and I would like to have some explanation of that very substantial reduction. Considerable relief was

[Mr. H. A. Stewart.]

required in Saskatchewan out of the \$20,000,000 voted at the special session, and if public buildings are looked upon as a means of providing relief why reduce the aggregate expenditure for public buildings in Saskatchewan this year to one-sixth the amount spent last year?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): In reply I can only repeat what I said this afternoon, that in the opinion of the government the construction of public buildings such as we have now under consideration is not the most effective or the most desirable way of providing unemployment relief. It cannot be denied that it does in a measure afford relief for unemployment, but a specific appropriation of a specific amount at a particular place may not afford the relief that a fund not so earmarked would afford. For instance, we might be constructing a building where relief was not really necessary at all. The government has adopted the other policy, and I think it has worked well. We are endeavouring to keep within our revenues because our expenditures are made from the revenues. I think my hon. friend will appreciate the importance of a government having some regard to the amount of the revenue at its disposal and endeavouring to balance its budget and keep its expenditure within reasonable limits. That is why we are reducing this expenditure.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think that governments, like people, should keep within their revenues if at all possible. I quite appreciate that and approve of it, but I wish to point out that a similar reduction is not to be found in the expenditure for public buildings in the other provinces. In the main, I think my hon. friend is quite right, that perhaps this is not the best possible way of giving relief, but still it is one way. The vote for Saskatchewan this year is just one-sixth of what it was the year before, and I cannot understand why that should be so with regard to Saskatchewan and not with regard to the other provinces. I am not suggesting that it is being done for political purposes, because after all the parties in Saskatchewan are about equal in strength at the present moment, so it must be for some other reason than that. I do not know what the reason is. There does not seem to be any particular basis for such a substantial reduction in Saskatchewan as compared with other eastern provinces.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I cannot add anything to the explanation which I have made so often during this discussion as to