

scarcely a nook or corner of Canada in which these two interests do not run and where they do not require supervision. Our large extent of sea coast and our large extent of fishing waters, which have to be protected and cared for, make an amount of detailed work as large, if not larger, than is to be found in any other branch of the Government. I know that from my own experience. If you look at the number of clerks, thirty-nine in all, I do not think, taking into account the work that has to be done and the immense amount of details, that the staff is extravagant. That a deputy head has been taken away is not proof that it was over-manned, but is a proof that it was considered better that the two departments should be merged into one, and that one deputy head should have charge of the whole—over-manned, possibly, in the deputy head's service; that must have been the opinion of the Minister. Not being the Minister of the department, I do not know exactly what work this new clerk is to take charge of; but I have no doubt that the work is there, and that he will do it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no doubt that the department is important, and has its officers in every part of the Dominion of Canada; but these men are there discharging public duties, and are paid for it. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman sincerely believes that a new clerk is needed; but the question is, what grounds are there for making the appointment. It looks to me as if the place was being made for the man, and not the man appointed to a place where his services were required. It seems to me that if a young man was required there the hon. gentleman who has now charge of the department should be able to explain to the House what services he is going to perform. Otherwise such explanation as has been given would be a justification for the importation of half a dozen men or more into that or any other department. The House always expects when new men are introduced into the service that a reasonable explanation should be made as to increase of work or other cause justifying the appointment. This case looks very much as if it were one in which the place was made for the man.

Mr. FOSTER. I will ascertain from the department exactly the branch in which this work is required to be done and the character of the work, and I am willing to guarantee that the explanation will be satisfactory to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The House is entitled to an explanation. This committee sits for the purpose of checking extravagance, and while the hon. gentleman may be convinced that the vote is a proper one, the grounds on which it is asked should be stated to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I will see that an explanation is given.

Mr. McMULLEN. I call the attention of the Minister to the system adopted in the preparation of bounty cheques.

Mr. FOSTER. We shall come to the bounty vote at a subsequent stage, when this question can be fully discussed.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the discussion is applicable to the present vote for salaries. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor-General's Report, A-102, he will find a list of clerks to whom were paid \$3,516, and in addition for the preparation of bounty cheques last year, \$1,898. This is part of the system adopted by every department. Why is it considered necessary to employ clerks during extra hours to prepare bounty cheques? Twelve clerks were so employed, who, although they were receiving salaries ranging from \$1,200 to \$1,400 per annum, were paid an additional sum of \$1,898.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will have patience he will get at the items for a similar vote to that taken last year. The Minister in charge will then be able to give him a satisfactory answer this year, as was given last year, or there would not have been a vote of Parliament for the amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That statement does not cover the question raised by my hon. friend as to the propriety or impropriety of paying clerks extra amounts when they are now receiving considerable salaries.

Mr. FOSTER. A discussion on this subject took place last year in regard to the change made from that of previous years when extra clerks entirely were employed to do this work, and the Minister showed that it could be done more economically by giving extra pay to clerks in the office. A special sum was voted for that purpose, and a special sum is asked this year for the same. When that vote comes under consideration, the principle can be fully discussed.

Public Works Department. . . . . \$50,555

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe there are a large number of additional clerks employed, while, I admit, there is very little additional expense.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will recollect that for a number of years the Department of Public Works has had a comparatively small establishment at Ottawa as the civil service establishment. It has, however, had a very large number of temporary clerks so-called, but who have been permanent temporaries, such as architects, engineers, draftsmen and the like, who had formerly been paid out of the votes for the different public works. That system was abolished last year, and a vote was taken for the clerks at Ottawa who had formerly been paid out of the different public works for which appropriations were made. The minister last year dispensed with a number