

Senator Beaubien: Are you looking at me, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman: Well, senator, I was looking through you to Senator Smith; but you were a chairman too, were you not?

Senator Beaubien: Yes, for a very short time.

The Chairman: Well, then, we have two experts, and I think it should be clarified for the record that in establishing this committee the Senate was not in any way attempting to override any authority that the Internal Economy Committee had and has. I think it was felt that the type of project we are now discussing was such that it was one that the Internal Economy Committee might find it a little burdensome to take on; and, furthermore, that the considerations that would motivate this committee might be somewhat different from the general supervision of administrative work.

Mr. Fortier: Of course, the committee has the power of recommendation only; it has to report to the Senate.

The Chairman: But that applies to both committees.

Mr. Fortier: Yes, of course, but I was thinking more of the Internal Economy Committee.

Senator Yuzyk: In that case, Mr. Chairman, would we have to apply for these funds through the Internal Economy Committee or would we do it on a different basis?

Mr. Fortier: I am about to come to that. You are now referring to the cost of whatever is approved by this committee?

Senator Yuzyk: Yes.

Mr. Fortier: Honourable senators will be interested to have a very brief resumé of the history of the installation of stained glass windows in the House of Commons. Miss Milne is here and she can correct me if I am wrong. These windows were installed in the years 1971, 1972 and 1973, and this is how it started. The Speaker, on his own initiative, entrusted the Sergeant-at-Arms with looking at the possibility. Several designs were submitted by various authorities in the field, but were not retained by Mr. Speaker. The task of preparing designs was ultimately given to the official parliamentary sculptor, Miss Eleanor Milne, and her designs were accepted. The windows were cut, coloured and assembled by the artist Russell Goodman under contract from the Department of Public Works. The glass used was imported from Britain, France, Germany and the United States, depending on the colours required. The cost was borne entirely by the Department of Public Works, and I am informed that the cost was roughly \$5,000 per window. Twelve windows were involved and the overall cost was under \$70,000.

The Chairman: Some of the windows were larger than others?

Mr. Fortier: Yes, there were two windows that were smaller than the others. They used them to depict the flowers of the territories. The smaller windows depicted those of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

In 1971, at the first sitting of the new session, the Speaker informed the members of the new window in the west wall—just one. He explained that this had been done because of the continuing problem of glare from the sun, and he informed the members that it was the intention to

install stained glass depicting the flora and fauna of the provinces and territories in all the windows. He said this, and I quote, "I should insist that this is an experiment", and he asked for suggestions and comments. I understand that no suggestions were made and no comments were offered. This was done because the action on the one small window had been taken without prior consultation.

The Chairman: Perhaps the authority in both houses is supreme. Certainly, the authority in the House of Commons seems to be unquestioned.

Mr. Fortier: I do not have anything to add to that, Mr. Chairman, except regarding the cost. Senator Yuzyk questioned the source of funds. Everything that has been done so far has been done by the Department of Public Works with funds provided in that department's Estimates.

However, there is something else that might be of interest, and that is the fact that there is a Treasury Board letter that the Senate received recently advising us that as of April 1, 1975 the Senate will be billed by the Department of Public Works for whatever tenant services the department provides—that is, for whatever work it will do in tenant-occupied premises. For example, we are tenants in the Victoria Building, and if the Department of Public Works has to paint the rooms, or something of that nature, then we will be billed for that. But it will not affect structural changes.

If this committee decides to have something done to the windows, I am given to understand that this will be a cost borne by the Department of Public Works. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Mr. Fortier, we are very grateful for this overview of where the authority lies. Perhaps I could summarize it briefly. I think it is fair to say that your evidence is that, first, this is not a minor change in the precincts of the Senate that is being considered; it is a structural change and it is more in the nature of a capital rather than an ongoing housekeeping kind of change. Secondly, the Senate is, generally speaking, the master of matters of this kind as they affect the chamber. Thirdly, when these changes are to be made, I would assume from what you have said, the Senate might very well prevent suggested changes by recommending against them. If I am wrong about this then I would like to be corrected, because this is going onto the record. But if the Senate should make recommendations with reference to change, then those changes are not to be carried on by any agency of the Senate, but are to be carried on, presumably, by the Department of Public Works. The Department of Public Works may very well consult with other departmental groups or agencies, but it would be the department which would call for tenders and award contracts and would see to the due execution of the work.

Miss Milne is with us this morning, and her staff has worked in this building for a long time on projects of this kind and, more specifically, on the windows in the House of Commons. I wonder whether what I have said fits into, and if it does, how it fits into the way that her people conduct themselves.

Mr. Fortier: Mr. Chairman, may I add a word before Miss Milne speaks? I think what you have said is right, insofar as the Senate chamber itself is concerned. I do not want to go beyond that in my remarks, because I know that a couple of years ago—and it might still exist—there was a committee of, I think, the two Speakers and the