

increased costs of excavation and construction, and have done harm to public confidence in administrative competence. Your Committee would have expected that, as soon as the situation became self-evident, those responsible for the erection of the project would have advised that a new site be selected. This not being done, costs increased to a disconcerting degree.

The matter of control of cost is of importance whenever, as in this instance, the project is to serve the needs of a department and also to improve, and to encourage others to improve, the architectural amenities of Hull. Evidence given indicates that administrative action was not of a nature as to make certain that the public interest was continuously protected in the financial sense. \$15,169,517 had been expended on this project to March 31, 1957. A relatively small amount has been spent in the fiscal year 1957-58 and it is observed that the Estimates now before the House of Commons include \$800,000 for "improvements" to the National Printing Bureau.

It seems reasonable to assume that in the future there will be other monumental edifices erected to embellish the National Capital. Accordingly, your Committee is strongly of opinion that no such projects should be undertaken until plans are sufficiently developed to permit reasonable approximations of cost to be given to the House of Commons when the Estimates first include an item to provide for construction.

It was also observed in the review of the Public Accounts that in three fiscal years amounts detailed in the Estimates for the Printing Bureau were exceeded: in 1952 the sum listed was \$1,300,000 but actual expenditures amounted to \$1,691,563; in 1954 the amount stated in the Estimates was \$2,750,000 but recorded expenditures amounted to \$5,208,386, and in 1957 the amount listed was \$400,000 with actual expenditures \$802,945. Annual Appropriation Acts have, since 1951, provided that the amount which may be spent on any listed public building, harbour or river work under the Minister of Public Works is the amount listed in the details of the Estimates "provided that Treasury Board may increase or decrease the amount within the vote to be expended on individual listed projects". While it is the exclusive constitutional right of the Crown to recommend appropriations to the House of Commons, your Committee entertains strong doubts as to either the desirability or propriety of Parliament also subordinating appropriating powers to the convenience of the Executive. In view of the fact that this practice has been in effect only since 1951 and is considered necessary for the needs of the Department of Public Works only, it would seem that the Department of Public Works could organize in such a way that it operates efficiently without any constitutional concession by Parliament.

Agreements with Architects

Established practice is to enter into agreements with practising professional men to prepare plans and specifications and to supervise construction whenever a department has a works project and decides to retain architects and/or engineers to design and supervise. Your Committee understands that no invariable percentage rate is used but, generally, agreements with respect to the construction of buildings provide that the architect will receive 5% of construction cost. Whether 5% is invariably a reasonable rate is a matter of opinion and is a subject which might usefully be explored, but for immediate purposes the point of concern is the propriety of entering into agreements so worded that it is to the financial advantage of the architect that planning be grandiose and assent automatic to extras and additions, etc. Since a Minister, or the Cabinet, has