

now with some of the interior details, which are supposed to reflect the originality and genius of the architects. They are, as I have said, slavish copies of the old buildings put up by the monks, the despised monks, hundreds and thousands of years ago. Why, Sir, even the dominating feature of the central entrance hall—what is supposed to be the corner stone, which begins in a shaft and then spreads out at its full height like an open umbrella—is a slavish imitation of an original bit of architecture to be found in the Lady Chapel of Lincoln Cathedral in England.

Mr. CURRIE: Also in King's Chapel, in Cambridge.

Mr. MURPHY: It may be in King's Chapel in Cambridge also; I have no doubt it has been repeated in a number of chapels in the Old Country, because the monks were great cathedral builders, sound architects, as well as sound men in other respects, in regard to which my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) might not agree with them. I want to point out the necessity of exercising a little common sense about this new building, the necessity of displaying some taste and some idea of the fitness of things in the inscriptions that may be used, as well as the necessity of applying some business methods to the remainder of the work that has to be done before the building is completely finished. I could point out other details in connection with the interior of the structure, all of which are copies of some of the details of the old abbeys and monasteries in the British Isles; but that is not necessary to emphasize the point I am making.

Now, in conclusion, I want to say a word to my hon. friend (Mr. McCurdy). He owes it to the committee and to the House to give full details as to the complete cost of this building. He should give complete details as to the arrangement with the contractors, and particularly what they were to be paid when the cost should exceed \$5,000,000. It is idle to pretend that the firm of P. Lyall and Sons, or any other shrewd and capable business men, would continue to work upon a structure when the cost has risen from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000, without being paid on some recognized business basis for the additional five millions worth of work which they have done upon it. If anybody advances that proposition seriously, then I would say to him he had better "tell it to the marines" because no sensible man would believe it.

[Mr. Murphy.]

In another particular, Mr. Chairman, I desire to urge upon the minister that the jurisdiction of the architect—or architects, or of whoever is responsible for carrying on here with a free hand,—should be restricted and that matters relating to design and to cost—and I would say additional work as well—should be taken charge of by the Department of Public Works, and the responsible minister should be in a position to give this committee and the House full information with regard to the whole of this work. For, in the last analysis, even though neither he, nor his deputy, nor his officers have very much to do with it, still the public will hold him and them responsible.

I hope, Sir, that I need do no more than refer again to the contradiction between the terms of the architect's report that the damaged building represented an asset of \$2,000,000, and the fact of its removal, according to all the information we have, without authority, and then to the erection of an entirely new building which has already cost double the amount it was originally said it would cost;—I need do no more than call attention to these serious discrepancies to emphasize the necessity of the Minister of Public Works adopting new methods under which the remainder of this work may be carried out.

Mr. VIEN: Before we go much further I would also like to point out to the minister the error which has been committed in translating an inscription on the central pillar in the main entrance from English into French. I placed a question relative to the matter on the Order Paper some time ago and I received this answer:

The inscription on the central column is a translation of the inscription, as finally adopted, which was recommended by the Special Committee appointed conjointly by the Senate and House of Commons to report on the method of celebrating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Federation of the Dominion. The translation was made by A. D. Decelles, C.M.G., D.Lit., M.S.R.C., former General Librarian of Parliament.

Now, Mr. Decelles has advised me that he was in no way responsible for the translation of that inscription—he denied that he had any responsibility therefor, and stated that he had nothing to do with it. That is as regards the inscription in French. The inscription in English is "baroque" as we say in French. I do not want to be considered an authority on good English but I know enough of the language to know that the English inscription is badly phrased. One needs to know very