

party. I do not think the Ministers of this Government should be so much given as they are to appointing their own relatives in the civil service. I do not think the principle is right, for two reasons: one is because it creates a jealousy among outsiders; another is that hon. gentlemen are using the position which the people put them in for the purpose of promoting their own interests or those of their relatives.

I think, if a member is elected to this House, and he has anything to give, he should give it to his constituents, and not to his own family or relatives. I, therefore, regard the principle as a very unsound one. It may be said, that both parties indulge in it. It is none the less reprehensible on that account. Two wrongs will never make a right. Then, the other feature is wrong, of bringing in a new man and giving him the same salary as a man who occupied the position for over thirty years. There ought to be much stronger reasons to justify that, than the Minister of Militia has given in this case. I notice that hon. members opposite seem to be prone to this principle, because I remember very distinctly that the same argument was advanced with reference to the bringing in of Mr. Lash as Deputy Minister of Justice under the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, as has been given to-night, namely, that he was a good man, and would not come unless we gave him the salary. He was given a larger salary than usually paid to new men, and the plea for giving it to him was, that he would not accept a smaller one. I do not think that is a sound argument, and I think the less frequently it is used, the better it will be for the service and the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. Minister a report from his deputy head with reference to the clerks in his department, showing how they carried out their duties, and whether they are entitled to the statutory increase or not?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There was no report and no commendations made.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no consistency in the actions of the Government at all, and I would call the attention of my hon. friend who is leading the Government to this point. One department has clerks, for instance, that of my hon. friend, six of whom are eligible for the statutory increase, but not one has been given it. The hon. Minister will not say that these are undeserving clerks and not doing their work well, because, if they are not, they ought not to be there, and from what my hon. friend has said, they would not be there if they were not doing their work well. What position is the civil service placed in, when young men, serving the Government equally well, whether in the Militia Department or the Justice Department, are discriminated against in

that way? In the one department they get no statutory increase, although they do their work well and deserve it, and in another they get the increase, although they are not doing their work any better. Is that fair? Can the Government hope to carry on its affairs satisfactorily on such a principle of divergence and discrimination? Have the Government no conception at all of the effect that will have on the civil service? Nobody who loves justice and fair-play, will say that this is not unfair treatment. You should either treat them all alike by giving the increase, or by simply giving increase for special good work, and that upon proper report; but for one department to refuse the increase and another to give it to all, or nearly all, its employees, is a discrimination which cannot be considered otherwise than unfair, and which will work to the detriment of the service. Another point brought out in the treatment of the department by my hon. friend is this. He says that he is going to make great savings in the department. We are now discussing the question of civil government, and in that my hon. friend has done what? He has superannuated one man, giving him a superannuation allowance of \$1,680, and he has put a new and inexperienced man in the department at a salary which this other officer, after thirty or forty years service, was receiving. What is the reason the hon. Minister gives? The reason he gives is, that the new man would not take any less. But the hon. gentleman has a good precedent for that. When the Drummond County arrangement and the Grand Trunk Railway arrangement made last year was explained in the House by the Minister of Railways and Canals, he was asked why he gave so much money to the Drummond people, and he said he tried to give less, but these men would not take any less.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I made the best trade I could.

Mr. FOSTER. When the Yukon arrangement was being so ably explained by the hon. Minister of Railways, he declared that the Ministers wore out their trousers going down on their knees and begging these people to take less, and the Government gave them the 25,000 acres per mile because they would not take any less. My hon. friend who is junior member of the Cabinet, may, of course, shelter himself behind the precedent set by the eminent head of the Department of Railways, who has so much experience in political life. But, at the same time, he has thrown completely to the winds the cardinal tenet of the Opposition which they have been preaching for years, that, in the first place, the superannuation business must be done away with, and that, in the second place, if you do superannuate, you must show a saving. My hon. friend shows a saving of \$1,680 on the wrong side of the