

17. The Department of Public Works... \$12,790 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The increase of \$1,360 is composed of these two items: \$960 for ordinary increases under the Statute, and \$400 for increasing the salaries of the Chief Engineer and the Chief Architect by \$200 each.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these increases made under special authority.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The salaries of these gentlemen are fixed by Order in Council, subject to the sanction of Parliament. The Chief Engineer, Mr. Perley, and the Chief Architect, Mr. Fuller, are two gentlemen of very high position, and their salaries are very small compared with the work they have to perform, and with the salaries granted to similar officers outside of the Government. I would have been disposed to ask for an increase of \$500 for each of them, but it was thought that we could not give them more than we give to the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the case of gentlemen in whom special skill is required, are the increases provided by the Statute, or are they made by Order in Council and by the authority of this House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The salaries of officers who are professional men and occupy a special position, are not fixed by Statute; but of course we cannot increase these salaries without the previous sanction of Parliament. I may say to the hon. gentleman that if these officers were to leave us, I doubt very much if we would be able to obtain as good officers, and with equal experience, for the salaries we give to these gentlemen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have there been any deaths or superannuation, or are the gentlemen of the staff the same?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. One officer was transferred from another Department, and one vacancy was filled; but the staff is not increased.

18. The Department of Railways and Canals.... \$15,227 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the changes here?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is one first-class and one second-class clerk more. These are the only changes, and the increases are simply the statutory increases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the first-class clerk who has gone? There were six last year, but there are only five this year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot answer that question. I will take a note of it.

19. Departmental Contingencies..... \$171,950 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a considerable increase in this.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In the Post Office Department and the Department of Agriculture, there is a large increase in printing and stationery and other contingencies, owing to increased business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is included in the amount for Departments generally? Does that include the High Commissioner's?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; this is for stationery generally, to the various Departments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the last Public Accounts, I observe that at the end of Civil Government, the High Commissioner of Canada in England, Sir Alexander Galt, is entered for amount expended in contingencies for his office, \$5,452. That was the reason why I enquired

whether any allowance in this item of \$171,000, was made for the High Commissioner, under the head of contingencies for Departments generally, \$18,000. Does this include any such item? In 1883, apparently, a considerable sum was included for the High Commissioner.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is, I think, no such sum included in this sum of \$18,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no mistake about this having been included before. It is the only head under which it perhaps could be charged. Does the hon. gentleman know what is included in that, in a general way?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not. It is practically for stationery.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain the \$3,000 for commissions?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will take a note of it and do so on Concurrence.

Resolutions to be reported, Committee to sit again.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House; and (at 11:25 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 14th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY LEASE BILL.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the name of the mover of this motion be substituted for that of Mr. Abbott, member for the county of Argenteuil, as the promoter of Bill (No. 32), to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No notice has been given of this motion, and it cannot be made.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would come under Rule 31, which says that the Rule requiring notice does not apply after the Bill is introduced. It is on the same principle as that on which the Committee was altered on the Bill of the hon. member for L'Islet.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not a correct application of the Rule. No notice is required by that Rule, because the House has defined the stages through which the Bill must go, but this is an extraneous motion not connected with the progress of the Bill through the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no such intention in the Rule. The rule of notice does not apply to the Bill introduced.

Mr. HAGGART. The former promoter of the Bill is firmly convinced he had a perfect right to move the Bill, but as it is getting late in the Session and an argument may arise, similar to that which arose the other night, he thought it better in the interest of the Bill that his name should be withdrawn and another substituted.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it comes under this rule—that notice should not apply to Bills after their introduction or to Private Bills. It comes under the same ruling as I made with regard to altering the Committee of the Whole for a Bill.

Motion agreed to.