

thing that has been said by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) with regard to architecture. I think if he will look at station 'C' built by the chief architect of the department, he will admit that it is a very decided improvement, and will give better satisfaction to the public than a more expensive building. There is no doubt that as regards the large commercial centres the question of increased accommodation will have to be met, and at a later stage I will have to submit some particulars to the House, and perhaps ask for a vote of money for this purpose.

Mr. MACLEAN. So far as I can gather, this new system of distributing the work of the post office and centreing it around the railway stations instead of taking it all to one building, is in the right direction. It will facilitate the handling of the mails and correspondence and, considered in its purely business aspect, the system cannot be expanded too soon. I am glad to hear the minister say that hereafter he will have the commercial and business aspect more in view in erecting or enlarging public buildings.

Mr. BRUCE. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if I heard him correctly when he put the question whether there were elevator works at Hamilton. I desire to tell him that the largest elevator works in Canada are established at Hamilton.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). May I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works, when he is looking up the amount that is paid for public buildings in Montreal and Toronto, to procure similar information concerning the town of Owen Sound.

St. Hyacinthe—public building—addition to, &c., \$12,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister for some explanation in regard to the public building in St. Hyacinthe. There was \$12,000 spent last year, or rather \$12,000 voted last year and \$12,000 is asked for this year. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the \$12,000 voted last year was expended or is this a revote? What are these additions which are to be made to the public building at St. Hyacinthe?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote.

Mr. LENNOX. It does not say so.

Mr. MONK. No, it is not a revote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It should state so. The deputy minister informs me that this sum was voted last year and that none of it was spent, and that this is a revote of the same amount to be expended upon addition to the building there to provide for the excise.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is the public building for in St. Hyacinthe? I suppose there is a post office?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There was a building erected in St. Hyacinthe, if I remember well, about 15 years ago, which has been used for the post office and customs house. About three years ago the division of St. Hyacinthe was enlarged. The excise service is in the same building and there are two or three rooms occupied by the gas and electric inspection service. The building is not sufficient to accommodate all the services. The revenue has increased; it has doubled, or trebled, and a new building is going to be erected next to the present post office.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is a very satisfactory explanation, but what I would like to know is why it was that the work was not begun last year. Can the hon. gentleman give a reason for that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was delay in procuring the site as there was some difficulty in the Department of Justice about the title. The matter was just settled two weeks ago.

Mr. CASGRAIN. From whom was the property purchased?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The first intention was to make an addition to the old building, but as the site was not found convenient the Department of Public Works thought it proper to buy another piece of land. The property was owned by Jule Laframboise, or rather by his wife, formerly Miss Buckley.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the item been amended?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no amendment necessary.

Mr. LENNOX. I submit there would require to be an amendment. The item appears as if \$12,000 had been voted last year and that \$12,000 is being voted again for the year 1903-4. If it is a revote it should appear in the first column and the item would require to be amended so that it will appear that we are only revoting that amount and not adding \$12,000 to the vote of last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was perfectly correct in stating the amount voted last year, but I am mistaken in saying that this is a revote of the same amount. Four thousand dollars has been paid for the site and the chief architect says that the cost of the building will be about \$15,000 or \$16,000. This would leave the balance of the \$12,000 after paying for the site and \$12,000 additional.