

Mr. FOSTER. The chief clerk and secretary is the same who has been there before—any change in that office?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No change.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Surveyor General is the same?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The same.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Commissioner of Patents?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The same.

Mr. FOSTER. What accounts for the difference in the salary between the old and the new? The proportion of the \$50 increase?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The Accountant is the same?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, who is this Mr. Rothwell, who is being made Law Clerk, and in whose behalf the Civil Service Act is violated by the hon. gentlemen—who always found most particular fault with having a law upon the statute-book and then coming down when the Estimates were put on and continually violating it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The epithet is unfortunate—not violating.

Mr. FOSTER. If these principles were so sound when they were not in office, why are they violated now that they are in office?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may say in reply to the hon. gentleman, that Mr. Rothwell was a second-class clerk in the department at a minimum salary of \$1,100. Mr. Rothwell is a member of the legal profession, and on that account he was in charge of the legal matters in connection with the department since 1884. He has from time to time since that date been taking more and more control of matters appertaining to questions of title in the department where the services of a lawyer were required, and his services in that respect have become extremely valuable. The hon. gentleman is no doubt aware that in the Department of Interior a large number of questions of a legal nature arise, and sometimes they are of a very intricate character. They do not require the highest degree of legal knowledge, but they require a fair amount of legal knowledge, and a somewhat intimate and thorough knowledge of the statutes relating to the various matters and the details of the business that comes before him. It would be entirely unsatisfactory to be obliged to refer those matters to the Department of Justice, in fact it would

Mr. SIFTON.

probably mean that there would be much greater delay in issuing patents in disputed cases than there has been in the past, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that that is quite unnecessary. It is my desire rather to facilitate the issuing of patents instead of delaying them; and that is the necessity for a law clerk. Mr. Rothwell has been in effect law clerk for some time, and the fact that he is called a law clerk makes no substantial difference in his work. The one point really for discussion, is as to whether the increase which is suggested is a justifiable increase, the increase is from \$1,750 to \$2,000. Now, I may say that while I have had the honour of transacting the business of this department, I have found that Mr. Rothwell was an extremely valuable officer. The hon. gentleman knows that I came into the department without knowing anything of the officers, and I had to judge of them upon their merits, and from the way in which they transacted their business, and in view of the extremely efficient manner in which this gentleman discharged his duties, and of the value of his services to the department, I thought it would be a proper thing, and very much in the interests of the efficient discharge of the business of the department, that the value of his services should be recognized, and that he should receive an additional salary. I may say that in view of the knowledge of law which he has, and his ability as a professional man, I do not think \$2,000 is at all excessive, in fact I think it rather a low salary for a gentleman of his ability and experience in those matters. It would be an extremely inadvisable thing for the Government to run any risk whatever of losing his services, because it would be some years before anybody else could acquire the same thorough knowledge of the business.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman give explanations now with reference to K. J. Henry?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Henry was appointed a temporary clerk upon the 30th of June, 1871, and he will complete his 26th year of service upon the 30th of June next. He has been employed almost continually as registrar of the correspondence and clerk in charge of the files of the department. His salary has been from time to time increased, until it has become \$1,800, and the proposition which is before the committee now is that his salary be increased to \$1,900. The increase amounts only to \$100, just double the amount which, in the ordinary course of procedure under the Civil Service Act, would be the annual increment. I have thought it advisable to ask that Mr. Henry's salary should be increased by \$100, in view of the fact that he holds an extremely important position in the department. I think it is advisable when officials are