The Address-Hon. A. Fournier

Mr. Fournier (Hull): The hon. member cannot avoid abuse; that is why he is not effective in the house. If he could only keep quiet and listen to others who have thoughts and opinions in which they believe and want to express he might learn something.

We took this property, and it was decided in this house that we should provide a residence for the Prime Minister. No one dissented about the project. Being the Minister of Public Works I was put in charge of the undertaking. There are many experts on public works. Everybody seems to know all about public works and what they cost. It seems so easy to criticize.

We had the advice of probably the best architects we could find. They came from Toronto, and worked on the project. After consultation with these outstanding architects who have left many monuments in our country, even in Toronto—

Mr. Fleming: You certainly built yourself one out on Sussex street.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): Go and ask the veterans if these same architects did not build a fine hospital in Toronto. They are the same architects. They were our advisers. They devised the plans and prepared the specifications. We were rebuilding an old home on the advice of the architects to try to save thousands of dollars, which we did save; and we can prove it. I think I can get the figures. We saved around \$38,000 by not having a complete new plan. I am not making up these figures. They were given to me. The architects said: You can hardly give a firm price contract on this work. We looked around and thought one of the best contractors in Ottawa was Mr. Garvock. He had quite a lot of experience and had done a great deal of work in this vicinity. He was so proud to take on the job that he only asked a fee of \$10,000, and we thought it was very modest.

He undertook the work, and it took some time. It was going on even before the government had decided to curtail housing in Canada. You say that we went along with the project and built the house. Would you approve if the minister in charge or the government had just dropped the project once we had started it?

Mr. Fleming: Are you asking me?

Mr. Fournier (Hull): I am asking reasonable people who know something about construction. Once we had started on the house we found it was quite expensive.

An hon. Member: I should think so.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): Yes, and I know what the hon. member said at a political meeting. [Mr. Fleming.]

Mr. Fournier (Hull): The hon. member I think he was wrong to say it unless he nont avoid abuse; that is why he is not could substantiate what he said at that fective in the house. If he could only keep meeting.

Mr. Fleming: What are you talking about?

An hon. Member: In Vancouver.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): I am not speaking to the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming). The member to whom I am speaking knows what I mean.

Mr. Fleming: I should like the minister to say what he means.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): You are not the one this time. The work went along. We paid the bills. We asked for votes in the house and they were approved by parliament. We proceeded with the work, and we did not spend more than \$284,000 on that building. That is the figure I gave in the house and the figure that appears in the records of the public works department with respect to the building. There is a building right next to that residence that cost twice as much, and if you look along that street you will see other buildings that cost around \$200,000. Yet you would deny the Prime Minister of your country a building that cost \$284,220.56.

Mr. Fleming: Over \$600,000.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): Read the figures.

Mr. Fleming: Look up your return. It is over \$600,000.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): I am reading from the return which was handed down in the house on November 5.

Mr. Fleming: Last June your return put the total at \$613,000.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): November 5 this year.

Mr. Fleming: Give the figures as to the amounts spent on the grounds and the furnishings.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): The structure cost \$284,220.56. That is the building, and then you add to that the cost of the property which was purchased seven or eight years before. If the hon. member knew all the properties we have in Ottawa, what was paid for them and what their maintenance has cost, he would not always be harping on the Prime Minister's residence. I could show you privately-owned properties where far more than that has been spent, and nobody ever mentions it. We paid \$140,000 for that old property. What was asked for it before the courts? Then there is the \$284,220.56 we have spent on the building. Before the Prime Minister went to live there-and that residence will be for all future prime ministerswe had to furnish the place. We had to buy