

insistent Minister will. But he said that Mr. Burgess did not show a willingness to promote the best interests of the North-west. I am sorry he said that of a Deputy Minister who is older than he is and who has been in the department under Ministers of both regimes for a long period of years, and has had the respected confidence of every Minister under whom he has served. Yet Mr. Burgess is set aside because forsooth he did not show a proper spirit of assistance to the North-west. I think that this criticism might have been omitted, because I do not think it was deserved by Mr. Burgess. But if Mr. Burgess, an able man, a man of many years' experience in the department, a man who knew the North-west—whatever my hon. friend may say—if he was not a man to be relied upon and to get information from with regard to the department, there was another man who was just the man for Galway. And who was that? A man who had never been inside the department; a man who cannot by any possibility have the history, the records, the atmosphere of the department. He must learn the affairs of the department—a totally untried man. I say nothing against him; he may be an excellent man for all I know. But it seems to me and to the country that to put aside an officer like Mr. Burgess and take in a complete stranger to the department, even though he be from the North-west, looks like forcing the position. Though the gentleman may not have the records of the department at his fingers' ends, he had the records of my hon. friend's (Mr. Sifton's) politics at his fingers' ends. It looks like a political appointment. The country is watching him, and it will be seen in the future whether the present Deputy Minister proves a justification for his appointment. I am not going to judge him now; that would be unfair; he has been in his position too short a time. But if he does not show himself the man for the place, then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has laid himself open to the strongest criticism and rebuke that this House and the country can give. With reference to Mr. Smith, the hon. gentleman says the Order in Council was passed by which Mr. Smith, when he came to be superannuated, should have five years added to his time. My hon. friend stated that, I think, but it cannot be too clearly understood that Mr. Smith at that time suffered a decrease of \$1,000 in his salary.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** It was some months before.

**Mr. FOSTER.** It was practically the same time. Mr. Smith assented to that decrease, and the recommendation was made by his Minister, but it was not acted upon in any authoritative way, that when he came to be superannuated, he should have five years added to his term of service.

**Mr. FOSTER.**

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The hon. gentleman is wrong. I said the Order in Council passed, but it was not acted upon.

**Mr. FOSTER.** There are Orders in Council and Orders in Council, as the hon. gentleman knows.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I do not know. Does the hon. gentleman repudiate responsibility for an Order in Council?

**Mr. FOSTER.** My hon. friend is a little too fast. Who talked of repudiation? Did I say a word about it? My hon. friend knows I did not. It will be time enough to pick me up when I fall down. I did not say that there was to be repudiation, but I say there are Orders in Council and Orders in Council. This was an Order in Council, if it passed, on the recommendation of the Minister, that a reduction of \$1,000 in salary be made in Mr. Smith's salary, and, as a consideration, when superannuation was given, if it should come, five years should be added to his time. That goes so far as a recommendation is concerned, but it has no executive force; what gives it that is the Order in Council for superannuation. But I want just to put this before the House: When a man voluntarily leaves off \$1,000 of his salary, an old servant and a good servant, as Mr. Smith has always been, surely it is not asking too much, when the law gets the authority of Council and when it has been exercised in cases of superior officers who have shown merit, to add five years to his term of service. And I am glad that the hon. gentleman allowed this to Mr. Smith. Not many officers, as the hon. gentleman knows, would submit to a decrease of \$1,000 in their salaries.

I do not know that I need extend the criticism to which I have referred. But I wish to again emphasize that my hon. friend by bringing these four cases down in which he has actually acted against the civil service law and has made large increases, has entirely negated the position that has been taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I ask my hon. friend—my honest and honourable friend—from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) if he will not now assist me. He and I have been opponents, but still we have agreed on many things. But I ask him if, with his record in this House of having consistently, year in and year out, opposed any increase that was extraordinary and not strictly in accordance with the Civil Service Act, he is going to support four increases, one of \$250, one of \$200, and two of \$100 each in the Interior Department at the beginning of this new regime. I confidently rely upon my hon. friend supporting my contention in this respect.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I was not present while the Minister of the Interior was giv-