

ing the explanations. I am sorry that I missed that part of the discussion. I will have to rely upon the reading of it in the "Hansard." I have only to say that I have generally opposed increases, and, unless there is a good, sound, justifiable reason for giving increases, increases should not be consented to for a moment. That is the policy I pursued when I was upon the side where hon. gentlemen opposite now sit; and I hope that every Minister when he rises in the House to defend any increases in his department or any other expenditures, will make a sound, logical defence. For my own part, I should hesitate to endorse what I condemned when proposed by my opponents, even when it is proposed from this side. I have confidence in the Ministers of the several departments that they will be ready to justify what they have done and give every explanation that may be necessary. Had I been present to hear the explanations of the Minister of the Interior, I should be ready to give my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) an answer to his question. But not having heard those explanations I am not in a position to say what course I would take upon this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. There is only one course for us. We must allow this item to stand until my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) has had an opportunity to read up this debate. It would be altogether unfair to put him in a false position. He ought to have the benefit of the reading of "Hansard" on this matter. Moreover, we are promised the report of the Minister of Justice on this subject, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) will allow the item to stand there will be no discussion on the items but only on the Minister of Justice's decision.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have sat in this House for a good many yeears, but I never had such a compliment paid me before by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) as allowing an item to stand for the purpose of giving me an opportunity to read the explanation with regard to it. I am glad to see him taking that course, but I think it would have been much better if he had done it before, while he was in office.

Mr. FOSTER. I must always be ready to pay that compliment to the acting leader of gentlemen opposite. It is now six o'clock and perhaps the hon. Minister could bring this down and have it here after dinner.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will try to get it by the time the House re-assembles.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Department of the Interior..... \$104,814

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the Minister of Interior if the office of Superintendent

of Mines is still in existence in his department?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Superintendent of Mines is an outside officer residing at Calgary. There has been no change in respect to his salary or position.

Mr. HAGGART. I see in last year's Estimates he was voted for as belonging to the department here.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is in error. Last year there was an officer who was called a Chief Clerk of Timber and Mines, he was voted a salary of \$1,400. The Superintendent of Mines is Mr. Pierce, who resides at Calgary and gets \$3,000 a year, and he is paid out of the outside vote. This officer to whom the hon. gentleman refers, and whose salary is now asked for, is a first-class clerk, and is among the ten first-class clerks whose salaries we are now voting.

Mr. HAGGART. Before six o'clock I was reminding the hon. gentleman that there were ten first-class clerks down here, and a Mr. Henry and a Mr. Rothwell, who make twelve, and that there were only eleven provided for last year. I suppose amongst these twelve he includes the chief clerk of mines, and the extra clerk he is providing for is Mr. Keyes, who is moved from a second-class to a first-class clerkship.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman was, of course, entirely mistaken in the information that he gave before dinner, that there were only ten full clerks voted for last year. If it is true that there were only ten clerks voted for last year, the discrepancy would be greater this year. But he says now the eleven which are mentioned in the Estimates must include the chief clerk of mines.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was not mistaken in what I said before. The facts were as I stated. I did apparently misunderstand what the hon. gentleman was asking about.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the discrepancy which I have pointed out was filled up. There was no vacancy, but Mr. Keyes was promoted from a second-class to a first-class clerkship?

Mr. WALLACE. Before this resolution passes I think we are entitled to a little further explanation from the Minister as to the reasons why he has asked this committee to set aside the law of the land in the Civil Service Act. The Civil Service Act says that the minimum salary of a first-class clerk shall be \$1,400, with an annual increase of \$50 up to \$1,800, which is the maximum salary of a first-class clerk. These two gentlemen, who I am quite willing to concede are qualified gentlemen, are trans-