

the order in council. Dr. Charles Saunders, cerealist. Perhaps that requires some explanation to most people, but it defines the office of the individual. When you come down further to the lower subdivisions, as a general rule, they are simply clerks, sometimes perhaps doing one thing, and sometimes another. I do not think in most of the lower orders of the service we can do much more than define them as clerks, unless they have some particular work. I have here Mr. C. Martin, assistant editor of the Archives. He is the gentleman who helps to edit the bulletins and publications that go out from the Archives. D. Drummond, live stock inspector; Mr. McRae, live stock inspector; Mr. McMurray, French correspondent, experimental farm. Then here is Mr. Watson, stenographer; Mr. Nolan, patent examiner. I hardly think it could be expected that we should go much beyond that. I confess I did think in so doing that I would be free from any likelihood of prosecution under the Criminal Code for dereliction of duty. But would it be well to encumber the orders in council with more graphic descriptions of the work done?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In some departments the reply is that there is nothing whatever. For example, in the Department of Justice there is no information available of the nature asked for in this address. The Auditor General reports the same thing; other departments report the same thing. The Minister of Inland Revenue seems to have complied with the statute and to have done his work in this connection far better than any other minister, with the exception possibly of the Minister of Agriculture, whose records I have not examined very closely. He has absolutely defined the duties of the heads of each branch and has given a fair indication of the duties of the various officers in the branch. For example, take his organization of the Department of Inland Revenue:

Deputy Minister—The duties of the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue shall cover the general supervision and administration of all branches of the Inland Revenue Department.

Then he names his clerks, stenographers and typewriters.

Secretary—The duties of this officer shall be to attend to all correspondence, other than of an administrative character, have charge of all records and supplies, and to have general supervision over the correspondence and supply branches.

Then he goes on to deal with the various officers of the secretary's branch. Dealing with the chief accountant he says:

The duties of this officer shall be to have general control and supervision over all work connected with revenue and expenditure, the work of the statistical branches of all services and the preparation of the financial and statistical reports.

Mr. FISHER.

Then he goes on to deal with subdivision A of the first division and proceeds:

The number and character of the officers in the Accountant's branch to be as follows:

1. Assistant accountant—To have particular charge of accounts relative to receipts and expenditure, to record each deposit of revenue, to have charge of the general journal and ledger and to replace the chief accountant when absent from any cause.

And so on with reference to every important office of his department. Then he has taken up the laboratory branch and dealt with it in the same way very thoroughly. I understand from my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), although I have not seen the organization of the Mines Department, that this has been done equally well. The other departments should have devoted the same attention to the statute and observed the same particularity and definiteness in prescribing the duties of the various officers that we find in the organization carried out by the Minister of Inland Revenue and Mines. Otherwise, a great part of the advantage from this statute will be lost.

Mr. FISHER. I perfectly agree with my hon. friend that so far as it is possible and consistent with conciseness the intention of the Act was to indicate these things in the classification. I think it probable that when another classification is issued that will be done to a greater extent.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to prolong the discussion but there were two points that might be considered as being assented to, made by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, if they were not noted. In the first place he seemed to argue that if the minister had a lump vote he could make any addition to the salaries of officers out of that lump vote that he chose. I am not sure but that he has the absolute power to do it, but I do not think he has the right. For instance, he comes down with a lump vote, presents it to parliament and says this is to pay officers' salaries. How many officers have you?—so many. What salaries are they getting?—so much. It goes down in 'Hansard'. It is discussed here and parliament says: Yes, that vote is all right, because we know those officers are in the service, we know what they are getting and we think it is not unreasonable. I doubt very much if the minister has the right, after having made that compact with parliament, to go out and, three months afterwards, raise those salaries to any amount he chooses. I do not think parliament will cavil at a reasonable addition if cause is shown but I should not like to let the theory go unchallenged that a minister has the right after having made the compact with parliament which he did, to add, out of that