

They can get it elsewhere, and they are tempted to leave the service, as in many instances they have done. Under these circumstances the government have thought it best that they should bring back again that class of third-class clerks who are called junior second-class clerks under this Bill. Practically it is a renewal of the third-class clerkships in order that we may be able to retain the services of young men and women who are best equipped for the public service, best fitted to do the work efficiently, and who could not expect to be given second-class clerkships at \$1,100 a year. There is a wide difference between \$600 and \$1,100 a year, and there is abundant room for the adequate payment of efficient men and women in the service between these figures. My hon. friend has asked: Where are these protestations of the desire to make the public service less expensive which we expressed when we were in opposition? My hon. friend received an answer to a very considerable extent, when, a few weeks ago, an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, asked a comparison in certain departments of the public service of the expenditure upon these departments to-day and the expenditure before we came into office. The answers to these questions show, that in three or four departments, although the service is much larger and more onerous than in 1896, the actual expenditure on civil government is less than it was in 1896. That is the way we try to fulfil the promises we made when in opposition. I do not think that it would be wise to adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), to appoint more second-class clerks, so as to give them the promotion they may fairly expect.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not advocate that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If you did not advocate that, do you mean to say that all these writers should be kept for ever as writers, and only be promoted as there is a vacancy in the second class?

Mr. FOSTER. What else do you want to promote them for?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. So as to keep them in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. You know it is very easy to keep your service sufficiently filled up.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are doing that, but efficient men will not stay in the service at \$600.

Mr. FOSTER. Let them go elsewhere.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And you would lose the best men you have.

Mr. FOSTER. No, you would not, you always have plenty.

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. You will have plenty of an inefficient character.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all. How many have left?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One left in my own department last year.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very large proportion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are a large number of these temporary clerks, who have told me that unless some such inducement is held out to them they will not stay in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. Let them go.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and the result would be that you would have nobody in the service that would be thoroughly efficient. If we are to retain the best men in the service we must give them promotion, and if we do not do that we will be driven to create more second-class clerks. Since I have been in the department I have been more and more convinced that the repeal of the Act in 1895 was a mistake. I believe the government were actuated with very proper motives at the time, but it certainly did not make the improvement that was expected.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What does the present law prevent the minister doing, except appointing a lot of raw men permanently in the service. If you have a special reason you can make a second-class clerk now, and if there is a vacancy you can promote a man. The Bill of 1895 was to prevent the appointment of inexperienced men permanently in the service, and this Bill will enable you to do that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And the hon. gentleman suggests that in order to prevent the best men leaving the service we should create more second-class clerkships?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all. Will the minister tell me how many of all the civil servants have left during the last three years?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say exactly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, that is very important, because the hon. gentleman founds his argument upon it. Who was the man who had left in his department?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was one of the assistant patent examiners whom I appointed, and I gave him \$600 but I could not keep him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where did he go?