

be reduced 10 per cent in their salaries is not immediately before the committee. If my hon. friends choose in connection with this vote to combat the principle, very well; I am not objecting to that. But I do submit to hon. gentlemen opposite that what we are doing at the moment is presenting an estimate of the cost of running this particular department, this particular branch, for the year 1932-33.

As regards the alleged clandestine nature of this presentation, my hon. friend is neither fair nor accurate. The Prime Minister, as I have already intimated, stated plainly in his place as leader of the government that it was the intention of the government to present to the house the necessary legislation, whatever that might be, to give effect to the cut of 10 per cent. Unquestionably there will have to be certain legislation. So far as this resolution is concerned, it will be followed by the customary supply bill. This resolution, providing for supply for this particular branch of the public service, will be followed by a government bill in its proper course. In addition to that, regarding such things as statutory increases, retirement contributions, and the degree to which the Civil Service Act is interfered with, all these matters will be taken care of in the legislation referred to by the Prime Minister.

Mr. RALSTON: That is not what the Prime Minister said. He was not talking about superannuation and matters incidental to the Civil Service Act. He said:

... a statute to reduce by ten per cent the indemnities alike of the Senate and of the Commons, and of the compensation paid to ministers and to every branch of the public service.

That has nothing to do with superannuation.

Mr. STEVENS: It includes all that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. STEVENS: Absolutely; there is no question about it. Whatever is necessary—those are the words I used a moment ago. Whatever is necessary to give effect to that decision will be brought down in the form of legislation. Now, if no estimates are to be granted until the question of the civil service cut referred to by the Prime Minister, the reduction in the cost of public service, is fully debated, then we shall simply have to address ourselves to the situation. We are inviting consideration of a special vote for a special purpose. There is nothing underhand about it, and it was not worthy of my hon. friend to suggest that.

Mr. RALSTON: I did not.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, you did.

Mr. RALSTON: Lefthanded, I said.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member used the words clandestine and lefthanded; if there were other ways of describing it he would no doubt have used them. The announcement of the Prime Minister was a perfectly frank one and it has been before parliament for over a week. These estimates were laid on the table yesterday, and printed on the face of the estimates is the intimation, following the announcement of the Prime Minister, of what it was proposed to do. We moved the house into supply to-day, and notwithstanding what the leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) said a moment ago about not wishing to take the opportunity, the fact is that we moved ourselves into supply to-day with these estimates before the house, full notice being given of just what the intention of the government was in the matter. I am not blaming the opposition for allowing the opportunity to pass, but it was there. The whole question could have been raised. I invite the consideration of the resolution now before the committee. This sum of \$211,000 covers the gas and electricity inspection service of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: And which contains a ten per cent reduction.

Mr. STEVENS: The question which was asked me an hour ago was as to whether or not there were salaries included in this vote and if so, would they be cut ten per cent. I replied that in harmony with the policy adopted they, in common with all other salaries, would be cut.

Mr. VENIOT: The ten per cent cut was there.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. minister has just stated that the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth (Mr. Ralston) was incorrect when he stated that the ministry, in pursuing the course it was, was putting the cart before the horse. Immediately following that statement he made reference to the fact that in order to put this 10 per cent reduction into effect there would have to be an amendment to certain statutes. If my hon. friend will look at page 15 of the estimates, he will find under the heading of "Legislation" items covering the salary of the Speaker of the Senate, indemnity to senators, salary of the Speaker of the House of Commons, salary of the deputy speaker and indemnity to members, including additional indemnity to the