

for all these purposes now because hon. gentlemen know that the balance will have to be asked for later, but to arrive at what may be considered a complete estimate I have brought this further information.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say that this is another illustration of what we have over and over again here. When it was contemplated to put up this building had the House been told that it was going to cost \$181,000, I have no doubt the House would have hesitated before consenting to authorize this expenditure, but on the ground that it would only cost \$100,000 the House somewhat reluctantly and after a lengthy debate consented to it. That was the commencement of an expenditure which at the outset was said to be \$100,000. We had scarcely got into the work when the expenditure began to creep up and within two years it had almost doubled. Are there not reasonable grounds for complaint that there is something wrong with the architect, with the government, or with somebody. Would this House have consented to going on with this building if it knew in the first place that it would ultimately cost \$181,000—I am not talking here for pastime or for the purpose of obstructing; I am protesting against a growing evil and I think the Minister of Public Works should give me his attention instead of speaking to his friends around him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I beg your pardon, I was speaking to the deputy minister.

Mr. SPROULE. It is only when the House knows what the total cost to complete will be that it can intelligently pledge the resources of the country for a vote of this kind. This building will cost twice as much as was intended originally and we find the same thing over and over again with regard to these public works and public buildings. It is an improper system and should be put an end to. I am obliged to disagree to some extent with my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) as to the propriety of towns and cities paying a share of the cost in the way of furnishing a site or paying portion of the cost of a site for these buildings. Public buildings embellish a town or city and confer a benefit on it, and I do not think there is any injustice done if the town or city is asked to pay a fair share of the cost. But whether that principle is right or not, the fact that Toronto contributes \$150,000 for a building which costs \$300,000, and that London does not pay a cent towards the building which is to cost \$181,000, seems to be very unfair towards Toronto. There should be some fixed principle. Let it be either that nothing should be contributed or that each place should contribute a certain proportion. All should be served alike. As my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) has pointed out, Toronto has just grounds

for complaint at this discrimination. I am not complaining of the present Minister of Public Works, because I think he shows a commendable desire to give all the information he can, but I do say that when he asks an initial vote for a public work he should be able to tell the House what the entire cost of it will be so that the House may form a correct judgment on it.

Mr. CLARKE. I agree with my colleague from Toronto that when an armoury is to be erected in a town a good building should be put up. I find no fault with the expenditure of a reasonable sum for this purpose in the city of London. The objection taken on this side is, that so to speak, the House has been hypnotized into approving of this building by the inaccurate statement made at first as to what the ultimate cost would be. We are not holding the present Minister of Public Works responsible for that. The principle laid down by the hon. members for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is one that cannot be controverted. Those who pay the piper should be able to choose the music. It is not fair to the House that it should be told a building will cost \$75,000 or \$100,000 when the fact is that it will take double that amount to complete. Now, I want to draw the attention of the minister to the oft told tale that while the city of Toronto contributed \$150,000 to purchase the site for the Toronto drill shed, that drill shed is not yet completed. Representations have been made again and again to the department. I have myself raised my voice in my own humble way in this House to urge upon the minister in all fairness that the additional drill hall accommodation required in Toronto should be provided. I commend the matter to the serious consideration of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland). It is not unreasonable to ask that the armoury should be completed. I would remind the minister that in addition to what else we have done, the city of Toronto has provided accommodation for the military stores. The city will be ready to give accommodation for any of the military stores in any of the municipal buildings, but surely a drill shed is the proper place for these stores. A last word to the minister. I hope that he will bring down in the supplementary estimates a vote to complete the original plan of the drill shed in order to give the needed accommodation to the garrison at Toronto.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter has not been brought to my attention before, and I am not familiar with the details of it, but I have made a memorandum and will look into it.

Mr. CLARKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the contract for the London building let by tender.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was let to the lowest tenderer for \$133,-