

to the proceedings of Council, from 1878. He has continued to do that work up to 1882, and on the recommendation of the Minister, this was allowed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That was surely part of the routine work of the office.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; this was done after office hours.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, there was no necessity for doing it after office hours, because the Privy Council staff was large enough to do it.

Mr. BLAKE. Besides, there is an express Statute on this subject. The law says that no one employed in the public service shall be paid for extra work. The very moment we lay down the principle that an employé in the office for doing something extra shall have extra pay, then everything more or less becomes extra; there is a desire to make everything extra, and therefore the law lays it down that this shall not be done. We are now asked to make a vote in bulk for four years' extra work.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I observe that this was done in 1878. I have not the slightest recollection of authorizing it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was Mr. Himsworth who authorized it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This sum was for special work, in the way of preparing an analytical index. He was employed by Mr. Stewart and worked at night. The hon. gentleman says the staff in the Privy Council office has always been full enough for all work; he is greatly mistaken. The business has increased enormously since his time, so much so that with a very diligent set of clerks, they have been quite unable to keep up with the work. Before Mr. Burpee's time, Mr. Côté, the late Assistant Clerk, was specially paid for this work, and Mr. Himsworth, thinking it was a valuable one, instructed Mr. Burpee to do it at night. It is like the work of preparing an analytical index done by Mr. Alfred Todd. This is a special work, very remotely connected with the every-day work of the staff.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see how Mr. Himsworth should have authority to promise this payment in violation of the law. Even the promise of the Head of a Department ought not to be given in violation of the law, much less that of his Deputy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was done under a special rule, and is not a precedent to be followed; but the work has been done and must be paid for.

DEPARTMENT OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.

To pay the following clerks additional to their present salary:—

214 { E. P. Aldrich	\$250 00
E. B. Holt.....	50 00

Mr. CARON. Mr. Aldrich came to my Department from the Department of Agriculture, where he had been working for a couple of years. He was appointed to my Department by an Order in Council of the 23rd of May, 1882, as a third-class clerk, at a salary of \$700; on the 1st July last he received the statutory increase of \$50. It was intended he should be paid from the 1st July, 1883, and the amount was placed in the Estimates passed last Session; and in the re-organization of the staff, his salary was increased by that amount of \$250. However, in putting down this amount in the Estimates last year his name was not entered, and as this was not in accordance with the requirements of the Act, the money could not be paid over to him. That is the reason it is placed in the Supplementary Estimates. He belongs to the Accountant's Branch and is considered by the Deputy and the officer who has charge of that branch as one of the very best clerks we have.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Mr. BLAKE. Is he not also the hon. Minister's Private Secretary?

Mr. CARON. Yes; at a salary of 300.

Mr. BLAKE. That makes \$1,300 under this arrangement, when he entered at \$700 two years ago; that is an enormously rapid rise.

Mr. CARON. What he receives as Private Secretary is altogether outside his salary. At any moment he may lose his position as Private Secretary, and have to return to his branch of the Civil Service.

Mr. BLAKE. When this gentleman is having the benefit of the law which provides for his statutory increase, when, besides, it is proposed to add one-third to his existing salary in a lump sum, the fact must not be disregarded, that he is also receiving \$300 a year as Private Secretary. This system of proposing modifications of the Civil Service Act in the way of increasing the salaries beyond the statutory increase is fruitful of great evil. It is likely to render the whole Act more or less nugatory, so far as the salaries are concerned, and produces jealousies, heart-burnings and difficulties in the service generally, calculated to demoralize the service by leading to the belief that there is partiality and favouritism. I am not making observations especially with reference to this case, for I have heard nothing of Mr. Aldrich whatever, but I say that is the natural tendency of proceedings of this kind. I do not think the hon. Minister has given us sufficient reasons for departing from the law. Will the hon. gentlemen also explain the case of Mr. Holt?

Mr. CARON. Mr. Holt is a third-class clerk, who was appointed by Order in Council on the 3rd of May, 1882, at a salary of \$700. On the 1st of July last he received a statutory increase of \$50, which made his salary up to \$750. The amount placed in the Estimates for this year and passed last Session for this salary was \$800, as it was intended that he should be paid that salary from the 1st of July, 1883. About Mr. Holt, I may say that he comes immediately after the chief accountant of the Department of Militia, Mr. O'Meara. Mr. Holt has had a large experience. He was employed in a bank as Chief Accountant, at a salary of \$2,000, I believe. That bank closed, but I may say, not from any financial disaster. It was more lucky than most banks; it paid every cent in the dollar which the investors had placed in it. When Mr. Holt, being out of employment, came into the Department, from his antecedents, the salary which he was receiving was very small indeed, and so small that, if it had not been that he was out of employment at the time, I am perfectly certain we could not have secured his valuable services for that important branch of the Department—the Accountant's Branch. I thought, in reorganizing under the Civil Service Act the various Branches of the Department, he was entitled to that increase of \$50. It was only an increase of \$50 this year, and I think it is a very small increase for the services he has rendered. His case is altogether similar to the case of Mr. Aldrich, but from the fact that his name was not given it was considered that under the requirements of the Civil Service Act, he should not be paid that amount, and the amount was placed in the Supplementary Estimates for this year.

Mr. BLAKE. There again, Mr. Chairman, this gentleman entered the service at the salary prescribed for him. He had the option of entering it or of not entering it. He entered the service at the prescribed salary Parliament had fixed, and he knew perfectly well the conditions of his salary, that he should have an increase of \$50 a year if he deserved it. The hon. gentleman says that he filled an important and responsible position in a bank, but notwithstanding, he came into the service at this smaller salary.

Mr. CARON. He was out of employment,