

permanence of the civil service in Canada more than anything else that has taken place before. I need only remind the hon. gentleman of the facts. Here is a party coming into power after having been out of power for eighteen years. That party has now been in power almost twelve months and, in the majority of the departments of the civil service there has not been a single change made. The hon. gentleman says he did not mean to discuss that point, so that I shall not follow it further. I wish to show my hon. friend, however, that he is taking a position upon a false basis. The civil servant, after he takes a place in the service, has a reasonable right to assume that he will remain there on what is called the permanent list. But if the exigencies of the public service require that he should be dismissed—if, for instance, his place is no longer required—he goes without any breach of contract. And the law, in its wisdom, makes special provisions for cases of that kind. It provides that if the civil servant has been less than ten years in the service he shall be paid a gratuity of a certain number of months' pay according to length of his service; and, if he has been in the service more than ten years that he should be paid what is called a superannuation allowance. So the terms upon which he enters the service and the terms upon which he may be dismissed if the exigency of the public service require it, are perfectly well known to him on one side and to the Government on the other.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, said truly that the party that came into power had to make its choice, either to make a large cut down in the number of civil servants who were engaged at Ottawa, and give them a gratuity which the law provides should be given to servants when they are dismissed in that case, or we had to provide that the statutory increase, so-called, should not be continued. I admit that there is a good deal to be said for both: I admit that it was a long time before we could make up our minds; but I say that after reviewing the whole situation we come to the conclusion that it was in the general interests of the public, and chiefly in the interests of the civil servants, and of the better class of civil servants, that we should resort to the scheme which we intended to propose to the House. Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition, I think, spoke without mature reflection. The hon. gentleman will see that it is not so much an understanding based upon the law that the civil servant should have \$50 a year added to his salary, as it is an abuse which has grown up from year to year. I believe myself that the law originally contemplated such a state of facts as the hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition depicted, that the deputy heads of each department should carefully analyse the work done by each civil servant, and

having analysed it, should report the result of his judgment to the head of the department, and the head of the department, if he chose so to advise the Government, would then advise that the \$50 increase should be given.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will excuse me, that has not been the practice, that has never been the practice.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why didn't you put it in practice?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then we would have been breaking what the hon. gentleman says is the understanding which exists between the civil servants and the Government, that they should get \$50 every year. I want to show that what we are doing is practically the same thing; we determined that the old system of granting \$50 increases as a matter of course, should cease. It has been granted, year after year, it did not matter whether the man deserved it or not, it did not matter whether he was what is called a four-o'clock-civil-servant, who keeps his eye on the clock from five minutes to four, and is ready to run out as soon as the clock strikes four—or whether it applies to that still larger class, I am proud to say, of civil servants who are ready to work up till six o'clock, and ready to work up till ten o'clock, if need be. The former got his \$50 increase just the same. Therefore, the man who worked hard and with an honest intention to serve the public, had no recognition at the hands of the Government at all; and the man who left his office at four o'clock sharp, aye, and sometimes was in the corridors so as to be out in the air when the clock struck four, just got his \$50 increase the same as the man who worked up till six o'clock, and went back in many cases and worked up till ten or eleven at night. We thought that kind of thing was not fair between man and man, it was not fair in justice, and the injustice which had grown up year after year had been crystallized around the statutes. So, when we came in we had to decide upon one of two things, that all these increases which have been given as a matter of course for years back were wrong, in which case I suppose we would have had to withdraw them, or we had to declare that increases in the salaries of civil servants should only be granted on the express recommendation of the head of the department who is responsible for it, and that recommendation would have to be approved year after year in the House. Did ever any hon. gentleman hear any defence made for the statutory increase, so-called, in this House? Not at all; it was taken as a matter of course. What is the meaning of this in-