

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to give my hon. friend information on the point he has raised. If he will be good enough to let me do it later, I shall be glad to get the exact amount paid to Mr. Mahony and also the basis on which he was paid?

Mr. J. D. REID. Let the item stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be quite willing unless it were thought desirable to close up the Ontario list of buildings if we could. However, I have no objection one way or the other.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the minister state that Mr. Mahony prepared the plans for this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to state that to-night.

Mr. BLAIN. Is not that a new departure? to pay a percentage to a clerk of works for examining the accounts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The percentage is not paid for examining the accounts.

Mr. BLAIN. It says here, 'commission on accounts examined.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be on the amount of the accounts. But it would mean that the supervising architect also supervised the work to which these accounts appertain. He would then be allowed his commission of 2 per cent on the expenditure.

Mr. BLAIN. Is not that a new departure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In some cases, a supervising architect is employed. When 5 per cent is paid, he draws the plans and supervises the construction of the building. It may be that in this case—I have not the information with me to-night—Mr. Mahony drew the plans and was supervising architect. That is not often done. Ordinarily the plans are prepared in the department.

Mr. BLAIN. Surely the minister does not say that the clerk of works prepared the plans for this building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Mahony is stated to be the supervising architect, therefore he is not clerk of works in the ordinary sense.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see a difference between a supervising architect and a clerk of works. You pass the plans over to the clerk of works, and he is a supervising architect, he must be enough of an architect to understand the plans and see that the structure is put up according to those plans. To a clerk of works the usual price paid is about \$3 a day. But you commence to give him a percentage. Architects charge from two to five per cent, but in the latter case they drew all the plans, and also supervise the erection of the building.

Mr. BLAIN.

I do not remember seeing or hearing of a case of this kind in the Public Works Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend may perhaps call to mind that during the session of two years ago there were one or two cases where outside architects had been employed to draw plans, there was some discussion over it, and some hon. members, I remember particularly Mr. Fowler, took the ground that outside architects should not be employed. The defence which I made was that at that time, there was a good deal of pressure upon the department in connection with public buildings a large number of which were under way, and I think in two instances outside architects were employed. In those cases they were employed upon these terms, that for preparing the plans and specifications, and supervising the work of construction, they were allowed five per cent. But I am not able to say at this moment, without the chief architect being here, whether these plans were prepared by Mr. Mahony or not.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it would be better to leave this item until you get the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did this man receive any other money for his services besides the two per cent, or did he receive pay as clerk of works and the two per cent extra?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Any percentage would cover his entire fee.

Harriston—public building—revote of \$2,980 lapsed, \$15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to know why these are called revotes. I think he ought to give us the year that this money was voted originally, and also some information as to why the money was not spent. On this one page alone there are no less than fourteen revotes. That is a new way of presenting them to the House. No doubt there is a purpose in it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will look at page 58 of the estimates he will see there is a column for revotes. In that column the only amounts which are contained are those in respect of which there were votes at the last session of parliament. The other items are simply put there in order to inform the committee that there had at some time been a vote for this specific public work which had been allowed to lapse. These amounts were voted in the session of 1908, and they were not used. The object of putting them in is to inform the committee that there had been at a previous session of parliament a vote