

plans but nearly in every case it was a failure. After six years of experience in the department I say that it is better that the plans should be prepared here in Ottawa. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) must not lose sight of the fact that there is always a time limit fixed in the contract, so that the employment of a foreman to supervise the work at \$2 or \$3 a day cannot result in extending the time. I stated last year that it was not desirable to spend too large sums of money on public buildings and I am still of the same mind. At the same time we cannot forget that this country is growing pretty fast, that we are not building for one year or for two years, that we are putting up these buildings for at least fifty years. It would be imprudent and unwise not to look to the future. Might I suggest to the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) that if I was in his place, I would not be too much impressed by what is said in this House about the erection of these buildings—*tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis* (times are changed and we are changed in them). If the minister will make a search in his department he will find hundreds of applications for public buildings. I was perhaps never able to gauge public opinion as my hon. friends on the other side have done, but I remember very well that for the past ten years complaint has been made in this House that we are not erecting enough public buildings, and the Public Works Department has had hundreds of petitions for public buildings from both sides of the House. If public opinion does not want public buildings, I verily believe that governments have not much interest in building them, because it is my experience that they give more trouble than power. The future of this country will be great; nobody can tell how many millions we will have in ten or twelve years. No one can say what the population of this town or that will be in ten years. I would suggest to the Minister of Public Works, that while remaining within the bounds of economy, he should not be too much impressed by criticisms which are indulged in by both sides of the House every time that a public building is erected.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not wish to unduly criticise the erection of public buildings, but I ask any member in this House if he were erecting a public building to cost \$39,000, does he think it would take over a year to erect that building. In my judgment it would not require more than six months, and that being so, what is the necessity of employing a clerk of works by the day at a large salary for so long a period as it now takes to erect these buildings.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If there was no clerk of works, the building would not be satisfactory.

Mr. INGRAM. There should be a limit to the time.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is necessary to have a good clerk of works and he should be there all the time or otherwise you will have botched work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was there a clerk of works employed on this building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) to say that where an arrangement could be made with the local architect he should get a percentage on the value of the work. I believe in that principle and I have done so in several cases lately. It would be a great mistake to let a contract and not have proper supervision on the work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who was the clerk of works here and how was he paid?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. His name was Henry Stevens and he was paid the usual fee of \$3 a day—it was perhaps lower than the usual fee.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is his usual occupation?

Mr. HOLMES. Contractor and builder.

Mr. BROCK. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has told us that we do not know to what extent this country may grow, and that is the reason why I am so anxious that we should be economical and careful. I have been doing business in the province of Ontario for forty-five years and I can tell you that you would be very much surprised to find how very little most of these towns and villages have grown during the last twenty years. The population of these towns and villages is being depleted all the time on account of those who go not only from Ontario to the North-west, but also to the larger cities and towns. Concentration is the order of business nowadays, not scattering. The policy of the present government seems to be to scatter their favours all over the country. I contend that it is better to concentrate, and that if a building is really required you should put up a good building, but these small amounts you are spending through the villages of Canada are not justified by the requirements. I can tell you that the post office and custom business has been as well attended to in the past, as it will be in the future in these new buildings. Because the Dominion of Canada is going to have an immense population, is no reason why the little villages and towns in Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario should have buildings that will be an expense for all time, and the expense of which buildings will prevent you from developing in the right direction, namely, in the direction of our North-west and the larger towns and cities.

A good deal has been said about a large amount of money being spent in Toronto. In consideration of the importance of Toronto as a commercial centre, I contend that