

all these years we have had to put up with very inadequate accommodation, and we have always been met with the cry, not that the building was not needed, not that better accommodation was not urgently required, but that the money was not available. I want once more to impress upon the minister and the government that they will have to get some other kind of argument or excuse than that to present to the committee, in view of the fact that they apparently have plenty of money to spend on embassies at Washington, Tokyo and Paris, and millions to devote to tearing down whole city blocks in Ottawa—certainly not a matter of urgent necessity,—while in various parts of the country the people are struggling along without any accommodation worthy of the name. The government is following a wrong course. Regardless of what side of politics we are on or what party we are affiliated with, hon. members have been extremely patient, appreciating to the full the obligations upon the government arising out of the war and the post-war years. But it seems to me that the government is not giving the members or their constituencies the consideration they deserve in spending money lavishly on such things as the purchase of the Russell block for about a million and a quarter dollars and the tearing down of perfectly good buildings merely in order to gratify the personal whim of the Prime Minister, who wants to erect a monument to his name in the shape of a public park in this city.

Item agreed to.

Waterloo public building, \$22,000.

Mr. LUCAS: Will the minister explain the item?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required for the erection of a public building in Waterloo for postal purposes. The probable total cost will be \$22,000. An order in council was passed in September last granting authority to purchase a site and the town council, the local board of trade and other organizations urged upon the government the necessity of proceeding to provide the accommodation. The postal revenue is \$6,356, and the population is a little over 2,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much has already been spent on this?

Mr. ELLIOTT: \$7,804 to the 31st of March of this year.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And \$22,000 more will complete it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The original estimate for the building was how much?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is the estimate. We are just starting the building now.

Mr. CHAPLIN: But more than \$7,000 have been spent.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That was for the site.

Mr. GARDINER: Will that come out of this vote?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That was spent out of last year's vote, before the end of the fiscal year.

Item agreed to.

Westmount—armoury, \$13,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required to pay the Westmount armoury association the instalments due for the year 1928-29 for armoury accommodation at Westmount. There are two instalments of \$6,312.15 due on June 8 and December 8, 1928, respectively, under an agreement dated May 25, 1925, between the Westmount armoury association and the Department of Public Works, whereby the association undertook the financing of the construction of an armoury, and the Dominion government undertook to pay an amount not exceeding \$13,000 for twenty years.

Mr. GARDINER: What was the original cost?

Mr. ELLIOTT: \$175,000.

Mr. GARDINER: Is the government entering upon a policy of renting buildings for armouries? Has not the policy been to provide armouries out of public funds?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is the usual policy to build them ourselves, but occasionally there is an opportunity like this of obtaining the building more cheaply.

Mr. GARDINER: Will these amounts pay for the building, or are they only rentals?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The armoury will become the property of the government after twenty payments. It is like a rental-purchase.

Item agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS: I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that the whole of vote 126 is not carried. One item stands.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): Yes, one item stands.