

side light than the old plan. Mr. Ewart's plan was objected to on the ground that the north end was on the outside; the Chambers are to be situated east and west, with a hall about 80 feet wide between the Senate Chamber and the Commons Chamber. That was done with the object of retaining the new part of the old building. The Pearson plan puts the Chambers north and south, the same as they were before, but not quite in the same position, and leaving larger light spaces, and consequently affording more light and more ventilation, and that was thought advisable. The idea of putting another story on the building is that the original plans of that same building, we are informed, showed another story. At the time the building was erected it was not found necessary to have that space, and to save cost one story was left off. It is now suggested that, as we are contemplating a structure which may be the Parliament Buildings for Canada for. I might say, probably centuries, it is well to make provisions for the future, and it has been suggested to restore the plan to its original form with the extra story on. It will cost, according to the architect's estimate, about a million dollars additional to put that story on, but of course it gives the whole floor of another story, while the roof will be the same as before with the additional story below.

Hon. Mr. OWENS—I understood at the time that the objection to the Pearson plan was that while the Chambers, the House of Commons and the Senate, stood out, there was a corridor around them. Such a plan would exclude the fresh air. To my mind that would be a great objection.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—That is the Ewart plan?

Hon. Mr. OWENS—No, that is the Pearson plan.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I have a good deal of hesitation in rising to prolong this sitting, but it just happens that I may not be able to say a word hereafter in respect to these plans, and I thought it desirable to say just a few words now. In the first place, it is desirable that no more money should be spent than is necessary to make the changes which are really desirable. Speaking for the Senate—I do not undertake to speak for the Commons at all—there is no necessity for any structural change in the building. I agree with the chairman of the committee, that putting on

an additional story is an unobjectionable thing and will give a great deal of additional accommodation at a not very great expense. As I understand, the plan proposed by Messrs. Pearson and Marchand would make a complete change in almost every portion of the building, and to my mind it would be a more economical and more satisfactory thing perhaps to erect a new building. I have heard the cost of the Pearson-Marchand scheme put down variously at from four millions of dollars to six millions, and this addition would bring it up to five or seven millions. Now, the changes that are necessary in the Senate end would involve almost no additional expenditure, or a very small one. With respect to Mr. Ewart's plan, I wish to put this point before the Senate. The number of senators now is about 87. It is not likely that within any reasonable time the number of senators will be increased beyond 96. Now, the Chamber which we have had since Confederation was more than sufficient accommodation for the 87 members. It is as large as the old House of Commons, which was intended to accommodate some 200 members. Mr. Ewart's plan, as I remember it, provided that in the reconstructed building, the Senate Chamber would be nearly twice as large as it was in the old building. Hon. gentlemen will see that there is absolutely no necessity for any such change as that. Not only is there no necessity for the change, but the change would be most mischievous. Hon. gentlemen who have been in the habit of speaking in the old Chamber know that if we made it any larger it would not be satisfactory to speak in. The acoustic properties were not very good, and therefore I think it would be a most serious mistake to make the Chamber so large that members engaged in discussing questions would be obliged to shout. You cannot discuss and shout, hon. gentlemen; and I think any proposal to make the Senate Chamber in the reconstructed building larger than the original Senate Chamber would be a great mistake.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—The reconstruction would make it the same size as the old one.

Hon. Mr. POWER—If anything, it ought to be a little smaller. However, I am not going to press that.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—The Commons Chamber is larger.