Mr. SPROULE. Is this building intended for the joint purposes of the customs and post office, or the post office alone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for the customs and the post office.

Mr. INGRAM. I find in the Auditor General's report, page V—100, the following account:

Potter, F. A., Potter, D., and Moore, T., executors estate of late Ann Moore, purchase of site, $2,500.

Is that what this site cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is what the department paid for the site.

Mr. INGRAM. Then we have :

Weatherald, T., surveying, &c., $31.80.

Who is that gentleman ?

Mr. HOLMES. He is the Conservative surveyor of the town of Goderich.

Mr. INGRAM :

King's Printer, $69.08 ; advertising, $152.89, $221.97.

Mr. INGRAM. Does this amount of $69.08 mean paying for the advertising of this contract to the government Bureau, or to whom ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is the account of the King's Printer and it must have been for the plans and specifications.

Mr. INGRAM :

Advertising, $152.89.

Will the hon. gentleman tell us what papers this advertisement appeared in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the list of papers in which this contract was advertised.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister bring it down ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be very pleased indeed to bring it down.

Mr. INGRAM. Now, there is this account:

Travel of Ottawa officials : L. F. Taylor, advanced ch. 960, $25.

Who is this gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is an architect in the department at Ottawa who went up to attend to this work ?

Mr. INGRAM :

Legal expenses, James Scott, $34.

I suppose this is in connection with the plans, specifications, &c.

Mr. HOLMES. It is in connection with the transfer of the property.

Mr. INGRAM. Was there any local architect employed in Clinton ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the work was all done in the department here.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year I brought up the question of architects in this House, and I find there are some ten architects engaged by the Public Works Department, or, at least, the Auditor General's report shows that number. I want to say to the hon. minister that this system of engaging architects in this country to look after public buildings is one that is not in the interest of the country. Last year I drew the attention of the department to it, quoting several buildings throughout the country where they paid large sums of money for clerks of works, to men who are architects residing in the localities in which public buildings are being built. The abuses that these men create in connection with the erection of these public buildings are simply these : They are paid so much per day as clerks of works, all the way from $2.50 to $7 a day and by reason of these architects receiving that amount of pay per day from one end of this country to the other the public buildings are being delayed in their construction. By reason of that payment by the day system, the work is extended for twice as long, yes, three times as long as it is necessary to construct these buildings. That abuse should be wiped out. It would pay the department better to have their own architects, or if they are obliged to engage outside architects to pay them on the principle of so much per cent on the contract price. Why, the way in which the armoury in my own city was constructed is a disgrace. They had two or three men employed on that building months at a time, whereas if they were paying an architect by fees he would not have put up with the method of construction; he would make the contractors whoever they were put more men on the work so that it would be completed quicker, and there would be less money to be paid the architect. I am not going to find fault with the present Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) because he is a new man in the department, but I say that the system has been going on for years and it should be stopped.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as possible I have adopted the policy of making an arrangement with the local architect, as to what shall be charged by him for the building. I think the rule is a good one, that it will probably save a considerable amount of money, and that we may get better service. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) remembers as I do, the erection of the public building at St. Thomas which lasted for so many years, and in which they had a permanent caretaker. We have to take warning by the abuse in that case and try to do a great deal better.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have tried on some occasions to employ local men to prepare