

of a first-class clerk, and then, not contenting yourself with making him a chief clerk at the minimum, you give him \$600 above the minimum. Here is Mr. Hall, who is fifty-three years of age, and \$1,400 is paid to him for superannuation. You save in salary, but by this inordinate jump, you are paying Mr. Keyes \$600 beyond the maximum of a first-class clerk.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend is hardly fair to a man who has been so many years in the service, and who is so well qualified to occupy that position.

Mr. FOSTER. How many years in the service?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Twenty-two years.

Mr. FOSTER. Cannot the minister run his eye over the civil service record and find scores and scores of men who have been there twenty-two years, and who are not getting \$2,000 or \$1,800?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. And perhaps ought not to be there at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, it is the minister's duty to hunt them out. I venture to say scores of men are in the departments who have been there longer, and who are just as good clerks as Mr. Keyes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think my hon. friend will find that to be the case. There may be many who have not advanced in their positions. If a man is fitted by ability and character after long service to fill an important position, why should he not have it?

Mr. FOSTER. But the chief clerkship commences with \$1,800.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As secretary of the department he has a great deal of responsible work.

Mr. FOSTER. Would not \$250 have been a good advance for a single year?

Mr. DAVIN. I come from a country where we have mainly farmers, and in the interests of these farmers in other days, from these benches the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and others, howled against superannuation, howled against the statutory increase of \$50, and here we have in one case an increase by promotion of one-fifth of a man's salary, and in another case a still greater increase given, and a man in the prime of life superannuated at \$1,400 a year. That is the style of thing we have to deal with in the Interior Department. It contravenes every principle of economy and goes in the teeth of all the professions made by the Liberals when in opposition.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Prime Minister say that such an increase is going to be made the rule? Here is a gentleman not

Mr. FOSTER

at the head of the first-class, and he is made a chief clerk, the minimum of which is \$1,800, and which would give him an increase of \$250. That would have been sufficient for this young man in the first year. But, what justification is there that he should be raised from the first-class, put into the next class above it, and put at the maximum of that class?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is an easy answer.

Mr. FOSTER. Easy if you want to do it.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, the thing is not without precedent. This young man has been appointed secretary of the department, and he is given the salary attached to the position. Suppose, that instead of being promoted from the service he was brought in from the outside, he would have been given the salary attached to the position also. Here is a precedent in point. Mr. Burgess was an officer in the department who had a well-deserved reputation for ability. Mr. Burgess was taken into a relatively inferior position in 1876. He had risen somewhat when the position of deputy minister became vacant, and he was given the position. He jumped at once into the position, and he got the salary of \$3,200 which is attached to it. Mr. Keyes gets the salary attached to the position.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman is quite wrong. There is no salary attached to the secretary of a department as secretary. You can make a first-class clerk secretary if you like. The deputy minister gets a minimum of \$3,200 according to law, and Mr. Burgess, an old servant, came in at that.

The PRIME MINISTER. He was a young servant.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, he got the salary of \$3,200 attached to the position, but there is no salary of \$2,400 attached to the position of secretary.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no statutory salary as in the case of a deputy minister, but my information is that the secretary always gets more than \$2,200. The salary of Mr. Hall was \$2,800.

Mr. FOSTER. He came into the service in 1865.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He served three years more than Mr. Keyes, and still you paid Mr. Hall \$2,800 for years, so that, you must have considered it an important position. The position of secretary of the Interior Department is very responsible, and the salary asked is not high in comparison with the \$2,800 paid for several years to Mr. Hall.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Hall was in the service in a responsible position; but Mr. Keyes was a second-class clerk. You ad-