

kept in a lower rank, you would not be showing proper appreciation of a good and faithful officer; and I think that circumstances might arise which would justify the creation of an extra clerkship in order to keep a man in the service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I agree that if you have a work of a certain character, performed by a certain officer, and cannot have that performed except by a man at a salary and occupying a position of the character mentioned, that might be a proper consideration for such a change. But the ultimate consideration would be the interest of the public service, and not the promotion of the officer. The Minister of the Interior put it on the ground of the promotion of this officer. The consideration to be had in regard in such matters is whether or not the establishment of the office is in the public interest. Some of the considerations that have been mentioned by the minister might, undoubtedly, have weight in determining that question. But it was not in that way that the Minister of the Interior put it forward.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the minimum of a chief clerk?

Mr. FIELDING. It is \$1,900.

Mr. FOSTER. The same as the maximum of a first-class clerk. Then, one of the reasons given by the Minister of Finance falls to the ground. Mr. Marchand is now receiving only \$1,600 and Mr. Roberts, \$1,500 a year. It will be seen that it is possible, if it be deemed proper, to give these men recognition in a monetary way, without moving them up a class, which opens the way not only for a present large rise in salary, but for their advancement to the maximum of the chief clerkship. Mr. Roberts has to earn \$400 yet before he reaches the top of his class, and Mr. Marchand, \$300. At the regular increase of \$50 a year, they could go on advancing in the position of chief clerk for years yet. There are other clerks there who are receiving more than these gentlemen, but you are promoting these two, who could do their work just as well if called first-class clerks. It does not add anything to the real ability or efficiency of a man to call him chief clerk instead of first-class clerk. And it does seem to me unfair that the minister should take these two gentlemen who have not arrived anywhere near the maximum of their class and re-arrange the order and system of the department by the creation of two new chief clerkships, the only reason given being that these two gentlemen are good officers. I think this system is being worked to a very large extent and it certainly seems to me to be outside the genius and spirit of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I seem to have succeeded in making myself very thoroughly mis-
Mr. FIELDING.

understood. I tried to say that these men were placed in these clerkships because it appeared to me that their work was such as required that they should have this rank in order that their work might be better done.

Mr. FOSTER. How?

Mr. OLIVER. Because Mr. Roberts is in charge of an important branch of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. And does it well?

Mr. OLIVER. He is the head of the branch—

Mr. FOSTER. He does it well?

Mr. OLIVER. He does it well. He has a large number of employees under him, and we believe that he would be in a better position towards his employees if we gave him this superior rank and increased salary with the result of securing better work in his branch.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way?

Mr. OLIVER. I am only giving my hon. friend the reasons which I wish placed on 'Hansard.'

Mr. FOSTER. No, you are giving an impression. What is the ground upon which you give that impression?

Mr. OLIVER. The ground is that if there is a large room full of men working together, all on approximately the same salary and all in approximately the same rank, one of these men will not have the same authority over the others as he would have if he had a higher rank and a higher salary. I think that is an elementary principle that even my hon. friend will understand and appreciate. That was the reason why Mr. Roberts was given this increased salary and promotion. If I failed to make myself clear before, I hope I have succeeded now. I just wish, in this connection, to touch on the position taken by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. He said that if the necessity of the service requires the creation of a certain office then the office should be created, and we should find the man to fill it. That sounds very well and it reads very well.

Mr. HAGGART. It is the law.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly it is the law, and I think my hon. friend will find that we have not contravened the law but we have taken our reasoning in another way. In practice it is a very undesirable thing to create an office unless and until you have a suitable man to fill that office. In this case we created the office because we thought it was necessary, and at the time we created it we had what we believed was a suitable man to fill it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be that the order in council will show whether the rea-