

Mr. FISHER. He is architect and clerk of works.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have just gathered from the Auditor General's Report that S. G. Curry has received in all \$4,499.77.

Mr. FISHER. Last year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As his commission on different works that have been going on there. I think that some explanation is necessary.

Mr. FISHER. At page V—76 there is a list of works which he has been supervising, and the commission paid him is for each of these works. I notice that in most of these cases the value of the work is given and the commission is evidently based upon that value.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At page V—77 I find a payment of \$2,559.

Mr. FISHER. That is for the same kind of work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is that additional?

Mr. FISHER. I suppose so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well then I made a mistake in saying \$4,499.77. Instead of \$4,499.77 it appears that he received \$7,459.35 and it appears that the more expensive is the building the more money this gentleman expends the greater the amount the commission he will receive.

Mr. FISHER. That is always the case in architectural work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does that apply to the clerks of the works as well? The more expense a man can place on a building the greater his commission will be? Is that what I understand?

Mr. FISHER. No, he does not design the building, it is designed here, the contract is let here, and he is requested to see to the carrying out of that contract. The price is fixed before he gets it and he is given a percentage on the cost of the work carried out under his supervision. This is the regular thing in architect's payments; clerks of the works are generally paid so much a day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Some of this work is not done by contract but under his supervision and the more money he would spend the more commission he would receive. Apparently he receives \$7,459.35 for his commissions on this work.

Mr. FISHER. That work was not necessarily done all in that year and all his payments that I can see are the two items of \$2,959 and \$2,958.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister will find a number of other items such as V—76, \$95 and payments for the Toronto post office, and the postal station, &c.

Mr. FISHER. These are the itemized statements, it is all included above, the two figures I have given are the only ones.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. Would it not be better to employ a man on a salary?

Mr. FISHER. That would depend on the amount of work to be done. In a place like Toronto we might keep an architect all the time, and if there was a great deal of work of this kind being done it would be cheaper but where there is not much it would be dearer.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. How does the minister propose to handle the large appropriations for the new drill hall and armouries, \$150,000.

Mr. FISHER. I think a special arrangement would have to be made for a thing of this kind.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Are clerks of works still employed?

Mr. FISHER. Not where there is an architect.

Mr. MONK. I would suggest, in view of the lateness of the hour and the absence of members for Toronto, that these larger items should be reserved.

Mr. FISHER. We might hold one item or pass these with the understanding that any Toronto items which members want to discuss may be taken up again.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend knows that is very unsatisfactory to those interested.

Mr. FISHER. If we apply that principle we could not pass more items, as the members for Manitoba I do not think are present. We will keep one item.

Mr. SPROULE. It is understood that any Toronto member may refer to these items or the ones which are held over.

Mr. FISHER. I am perfectly willing.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I see that Mr. Curry gets five per cent commission on this work in Toronto.

Mr. FISHER. When Mr. Currie prepares plans and designs for the buildings as in the case of the customs house he gets five per cent. When he acts simply as clerk of the works and supervising architect, and the plans are prepared here, he only gets two and a half per cent.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. For superintending work on the post office, he gets seven and a half per cent.

Mr. FISHER. That is the usual payment to architects for repairs of that kind. This kind of work is much more difficult than designing a new building.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. A great deal of this repair work is done by day labour, of which I approve, especially on small jobs,