

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend must know that in all the departments of the service these increases are asked on the responsibility of the minister, and I am satisfied that this man is entitled to an increased remuneration. From my own knowledge of the work that he has to perform and the responsibility placed upon him, I think he is entitled to this at least, and in my opinion to more.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, what does the minister say with reference to the next one? Here is a man, Mr. Keys, to whom we are asked to vote \$2,200, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Whose place does Mr. Keyes take?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He succeeds Mr. John R. Hall.

Mr. FOSTER. What became of Mr. Hall?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He was placed on the retired list.

Mr. FOSTER. At what age?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. His age was fifty-three.

Mr. FOSTER. And he got what allowance?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He got \$1,456.

Mr. DAVIN. A year?

Mr. FOSTER. What did Mr. Keyes get?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. \$1,550 in his former position.

Mr. FOSTER. What reason can the hon. minister give for taking a man who was getting \$1,550 and giving him \$2,400?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suppose it would not be fair for me to ask the hon. gentleman who was responsible for the salary of his predecessor, which was \$2,800, I understand that Mr. Keyes has been twenty odd years in the service. He had worked up, and was thought well qualified to occupy this important position made vacant by the retirement of Mr. Hall, who received \$2,800. He has received this promotion.

Mr. FOSTER. That is no reason at all. Does the hon. minister mean to take the ground that when an old officer retires anybody who gets his place has his salary immediately put up to that amount? The point is that Mr. Keyes was getting \$1,550. That was the salary of a first-class clerk, not at the maximum. The maximum salary of a first-class clerk would be \$1,800. So that it would take \$250 to reach the maximum by regular grades of \$50 each, which Mr. Keyes had to earn if he had been promoted in the line of a first-class clerk. Then, the hon. minister knows that the next rank is that of a chief clerk, and a chief clerk commences, not with a salary

of \$2,400. Does not the hon. minister think that it would have been quite a sufficient raise if Mr. Keyes had been made a chief clerk with the minimum salary of a chief clerkship instead of giving him \$850 of a raise and making his salary \$2,400? What justification has the hon. minister for giving Mr. Keyes an advancement of \$250 to allow him the maximum of a first-class clerkship, and then adding this large amount to bring his salary up to \$2,400. Why would he not put it at the minimum of a chief clerk?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The position is a very important one. I do not know that the salary is fixed at all except by precedent. Therefore, in positions of that kind there is no rule as regards salaries. Whatever parliament thinks fit to fix the salaries at has been accepted as the amounts at which these salaries should properly be fixed. I can give no other explanation than that Mr. Keyes has been for a great many years in the department. He was picked out as an officer who is qualified by experience and by ability in every way for the position. I suppose that if one who had never been in the department had been appointed, it would have been reasonable to have fixed his salary at a lower amount than one who had been in the department, and particularly one who had been for so many years in the department, whose ability and character are so well known. Mr. Keyes being the best man to appoint, I think, it is reasonable that he should be paid this salary, which does not approach to the salary of his predecessor within \$400 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. And it is quite a little less than the First Minister gets.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am inclined to think that the duties of the office and the ability of the man entitle him to this amount.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister has missed the point entirely. The minister thinks that these salaries are fixed at the caprice of parliament. But we have a civil service system, and when you get these first-class clerks or chief clerks they commence at a minimum and go up to a maximum by certain grades. If Mr. Keyes had been at the head of the first-class, the natural step would have been to have got a promotion to the chief clerkship, and to have commenced at the maximum salary. But, he was given \$250 of a raise to get him to the head of his own class, and then given \$600 more, and paid \$2,400. There is no justification in the world for that. This is a case simply of the minister doing just what he likes and expecting the party to do as his whim dictates. No reason at all has been shown why you should take Mr. Keyes from \$250 below the maximum