

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was put up for exercise and drilling purposes. The Militia Department seemed to think it necessary.

Mr. HUGHES. And for the officers, was it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the officers as well.

Mr. J. D. REID. What I cannot understand is this. The Militia Department first submitted a memorandum to the Department of Public Works stating that they wanted an armoury at Guelph, and the department gave them a plan of the building and let a contract for \$80,000; and then a month or two afterwards, I suppose, they come along and say: 'We want another storey costing \$34,000 or about half as much more money as was to be spent on this building as first estimated. Now, the Minister of Public Works at the time—I do not know whether it was the present minister or not—informed this House of the amount it was intended to spend on this building and the members here, and the public took it for granted that the statements made by the minister as to the amount in the estimates was absolutely correct. But, instead of that, every year the expenditure on the building is from fifty to one hundred per cent more than that stated in the information given.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building of the additional storey over the gun shed was not contemplated when the original contract was entered into. I hesitated for a good while, but I was pressed very strongly to put on this additional storey, and, after getting all the information we could, it seemed as if it was the reasonable thing to do.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who pressed the minister to put on the extra storey?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was pressed most strongly by the member for the constituency. He represented that there was a very strong feeling among the people that we should do this.

Mr. J. D. REID. But, merely because the member for the constituency asked for it, that is hardly a reason for adding almost fifty per cent to the expenditure. Here was a building being erected at the request of the Militia Department. A contract is entered into for \$80,000. Then, an additional storey is put on simply because the hon. member representing the constituency asked for it, though the cost was almost half the original contract and though the Militia Department has not requested the change. The Militia Department was to use this building, and the Minister of Public Works would have been justified in refusing the request of the member for the constituency until the Militia Department requested a change. I think the minister

is open to censure for failing in this way to recognize the Militia Department.

Mr. BLAIN. At page V-79 of the Auditor General's Report, I find, under the title 'Guelph Armoury' this entry:—

Clerk of works, W. A. Mahony, services, 2 per cent commission on accounts examined.

I do not recollect any case of a clerk of works being paid by a commission on the accounts he passes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sometimes architects are employed to supervise construction and they are paid a percentage.

Mr. BLAIN. But he was clerk of works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is an architect. That is why he was paid a commission. It is the usual way where architects are employed.

Mr. BLAIN. I have been a rather close student of the Auditor General's Report, and it strikes me that this is rather a new departure. I understood that the clerk of works had a daily remuneration for the number of days he was at work. Among the accounts passed by Mr. Mahony, I notice, that of Taylor-Forbes Co., putting in two boilers. This gentleman examined these accounts and is paid a percentage.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not for examining the accounts, but for supervising the construction of the building, which, of course, involves the certifying of the accounts.

Mr. BLAIN. I see it stated also that Mr. Mahony is charged with:

Five per cent commission on accounts for plans and superintendence.

I feel confident that this is a new departure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In some instances architects have been employed to prepare plans and superintend, and I think 5 per cent is the usual fee given to these architects.

Mr. BLAIN. Did this clerk of works prepare the plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure of that. But the amount paid him is not large, though he was paid 2 per cent on the accounts—

Mr. SPROULE. Did not he get 5 per cent on any plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hon. members will see that the total paid him is only \$1,254.57, while 5 per cent on the total cost would have amounted to something in the vicinity of something like \$7,000.

Mr. BLAIN. But he was paid some in a former year. This item says 'less paid in 1905-6.'