

that they are to be pampered by society or the curled darlings of fashion. The hon. Minister himself, who is a man of university training, and who knows something of logic, knows that if a man gives a reason for a proposition which he lays down, and that reason is found not to exist, the proposition falls completely. He laid down the proposition that this man should receive \$2,400, and the reason he gave was, that the cost of living in Ottawa was great. I am sure that at Kentville, save in apples, the cost of living is as great as it is in Ottawa, and the hon. gentleman is not justified in giving this man \$600 more than he would to any other good accountant. The hon. gentleman advanced another reason, and it was a lame and impotent one. He said that this man was a brother of an hon. member here. What do we care about that? It is not the principle of this Opposition, I can tell him, to place men in the public service merely because they happen to be relatives of prominent politicians. He says some Conservatives did it. The more shame to the Conservatives, if they did it. We who are in this Opposition do not justify any Conservative Minister who may have taken relatives into his office; and I echo what the ex-Minister of Finance said, that, above all, to take into the responsible accountant's office a near relative of the Minister, is utterly unjustifiable. Why, Sir, a thing like that, but not so flagrant or heinous, drove one of the greatest lawyers that ever sat on the English woolsack, Lord High Chancellor Westbury, from office, and the other day, in France, a man high in political life was driven from his position because he was guilty of nepotism. The people of Canada want to see the same high standard introduced into our public life that exists in England, where we have the august mother of parliaments, on which our own is modelled; and so long as I sit in this House, I will protest in the strongest terms I can against thrusting on the public service men because they happen to be relatives of the Ministers. If the salaries of the Ministers are not high enough—and I think they are not—let us raise them; but let us not do it an underhand way by appointing relatives of the Ministers to office. The Minister adds \$600 to the \$1,800 of the late accountant, and he superannuates him at \$1,680. This is equal to 33½ of the statutory increases; and then he has the equivalent of 12 statutory increases given to the man who comes in, so that you have 45½ statutory increases swallowed up in this one's man's case. So that, while they are boasting, and boasting hypocritically, of their economy in refusing the statutory increases, in this one case—and it is part and parcel of their whole policy—they add on a burden to the public Treasury equal to 45½ statutory increases. For that reason, I move that the amount placed in this item over and against the accountant shall be reduced by \$600.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Militia whether his deputy made a report in this case, as required by subsection 3 of section 37 of the Civil Service Act?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He did.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Let me read this for the benefit of the committee:

The Governor in Council may, without reference to the age of the person, if the head of the department concur in such report, select and appoint such person as is deemed best fitted to fill the vacancy, subject to such examination as is suggested in the report.

That report would not be complete, in my judgment, unless an examination of some kind had been suggested in it by the deputy head. Then if the deputy head did suggest an examination, the head of the department must have ignored the suggestion, inasmuch as we have been informed by the hon. Minister that no examination was held. With regard to the contention of the hon. Minister that the position is a technical one within the meaning of the Act, I must say that I never heard any more absurd contention put forward. It simply means that the Government may ignore every line and section of the Act. The existence of a society of chartered accountants is no reason why the members of that society should be placed on the status of a profession. They are not a profession in the sense of the Civil Service Act or in the sense that members of the other professions are, which are chartered by Act of Parliament. I have not heard any argument put forward that will justify this most extraordinary proceeding. Assuming that the qualifications for this position are technical, within the meaning of the Act, and assuming that a professional accountant should be appointed to take the place of the old and experienced official who preceded him, there is nothing in that contention to justify this Government in appointing as chief clerk a new man with a salary of \$2,400, or the full maximum of that office. That cannot be justified. In 1895 my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Wallace) appointed to the office of accountant of the Customs Department a gentleman with every technical knowledge required in order to keep the books of that most important financial department perhaps in the whole Government, in so far as the keeping of books is concerned—in which \$20,000,000 a year have to be accounted for in one way or another—and that gentleman received a salary of \$1,650, and has gone on relying upon the statutory increase as the only addition to his salary. The position of accountant to the Department of Inland Revenue, perhaps, requires more technical qualification than even that of customs, and I venture to say that no gentleman who has not experience in the methods of bookkeeping in that branch of the service could take his place,