

Campbell (Hampton), Cartwright (Sir Richard), Cassidy, Cockburn, Courcel, Davies, Desaulniers (Mask'ngé), Desjardins, Dupont, Edgar, Fairbank,	Holmes, Innes, Irvine, Jackson, King, Kirk, Landerkin, Langelier, Laurier, Lister,	Scriven, Somerville (Brant), Somerville (Bruce), Springer, Sutherland (Oxford), Trow, Vail, Watson, Weldon, Wilson.—64.
--	---	--

**NATS:**

**Messieurs.**

Abbott, Allison, Bain (Soulanges), Baker (Missisquoi), Baker (Victoria), Beaty, Bell, Benoit, Bergin, Billy, Blondeau, Bowell, Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Victoria), Campbell (Victoria), Carling, Caron (Sir Adolphe), Chapleau, Oimon, Cochrane, Colby, Coutigan, Coughlin, Curran, Guthbert, Daly, Daoust, Dawson, Desaulniers (St. Maurice), Dickinson, Dodd, Dugas, Dundas, Everett, Farrow, Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Ferguson (Welland), Fortin, Foster, Girouard, Gordon, Grandbois, Guillet, Hackett, Haggart, Hall, Hay, Hesson, Hickey, Homer, Hurteau, Jamieson, Jenkins, Kilvert, Kinney, Kranz, Landry (Montmagny), Langevin (Sir Hector), Lesage, Macdonald (King's), Mackintosh, Macmaster, Macmillan (Middlesex), McMillan (Vaudreuil), McCallum, McCarthy, McDougald (Picton), McDougall (O. Breton), McLellan, McNeil, Massue,	Montplaisir, O'Brien, Orton, Painé, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pruyn, Reid, Riopel, Robertson (Hamilton), Robertson (Hastings), Ross, Royal, Shakespeare, Shady, Small, Sproule, Stairs, Taschereau, Tassé, Taylor, Temple, Thompson (Antigonish), Townshend, Tupper, Tyrwhitt, Vanasse, Wallace (York), Ward, White (Cardwell), White (Hastings), White (Renfrew), Wood (Brockville), Wood (Westmoreland), Wright.—106.
---	---	---

Amendment negatived.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Contingencies, Post Office and Finance Departments.....\$2,800

Mr. MULOCK. I made an enquiry a short time ago from the Minister of Finance as to the deposits in the Finance Department and Savings Banks exceeding \$1,000. The Minister stated that it would involve so much trouble that he could not furnish the information immediately, but he intimated that, if the question had referred to the end of the financial year instead of the year ending on the 31st December, the information could be furnished. If I put a question in that form, could I get the information desired?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. I will get the information.

Mr. MULOCK. Will it be necessary for me to put the question on the paper?

Mr. McLELAN. No, I will make a note of it.

Civil Service Board of Examiners, &c.....\$7,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is an increase here of about \$1,500. What is that for?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Last year we increased the salary of the commissioners \$300 a piece, making \$900. As to the rest, we have taken the average of the increase of previous years, amounting to about \$600 or \$700, making the \$1,500. However, I think we might reduce the item, as I

think \$1,000 increase will be sufficient to meet the requirements.

Salaries for Board of Examiners, &c., under the Civil Service Act.....\$7,000

Mr. MULOCK. Last year when the House was asked to vote the sum of \$6,000, I understood the Secretary of State to assure the House that the item would not require to be increased; and now we are asked to increase it by \$1,000. It was pointed out in committee last year that an increase would inevitably follow by adopting what was called on this side of the House a very vicious system. Now, just what was anticipated has happened, and I presume this vote will need to be increased each year. I would ask the Secretary of State what is the cause of this increase? Is it because the work has increased?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. One of the great reasons is this: At the next examination we shall have over 700 candidates instead of the 350 we had last, and it takes, for the stationery alone, the increased sum we have asked for. If we can reduce it we will do so, but I do not think we can. I may add that we expect that this increased sum will be more than half compensated by the fees that will be paid by the candidates. We do not take the fees into the account, because they go into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I may say that this \$1,000 is only the larger number calculated for the next examination.

Mr. MULOCK. It increases the salary of each examiner to the extent of \$300.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We cannot help that.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand it is expected that there will be 700 candidates examined for this money.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, in the month of May next.

Mr. MULOCK. And if there is the same number in the fall, there will be 1,400 papers to be read by each examiner.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, perhaps so. After the next examination I expect there will have been over 1,500 persons who will have passed the qualifying examination. But I think we may reduce the examinations to one each year, which will reduce the number of applicants.

Mr. BLAKE. The woods are full of them.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad that the Secretary of State has become a convert to that view. Last year he took the opposite ground. Last year there were in all four examinations, two fixed examinations and some supplementary ones for the lame fellows.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have been speaking of promotion examinations.

Mr. MULOCK. There were examinations, too, for persons who failed in the original examinations. It is just what was anticipated. We told the Secretary of State last year that he would be asking for more money this year. I told him he was inducing young men to go into this vicious system of applying for public situations, and he now admits it, but if he is going to reduce the number of examinations to one each year, he will find that the number of candidates will be less; and if we adopt that system it is not necessary to increase the salaries.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We thought we would provide for 350 on the average, but we shall have 700 at the next examination. It is a necessary expense, and I repeat that it will be more than covered by the fees of \$2 that each man will pay. The salaries of the examiners were \$300 last year, and now they will be \$600.