

they were voting against their own party. I did not purpose to move on going into supply any want of confidence motion to enable the government in that way to get out of its difficulties. I think the government is entitled to give its own supporters a hearing on this question, as well as the opposition.

My right hon. friend says I could do it to-morrow. In view of what he has said I am not going to wait until to-morrow; I am going to do it now. We will stay right with this matter as long as hon. gentlemen opposite try to put through these votes in this way.

Mr. POULIOT: This discussion reminds me of a means taken during the war to divert the thoughts of soldiers on leave from the realities of the conflict. In the Paris restaurants they began inventing new dances—the fox trot, the hesitation waltz, and finally the Wilson dance, which consisted of one step forward, one step backward and one step aside. Last year the government increased the salaries of the ministers by \$2,000, though they called it a special allowance instead of an increase in salary. I know the leader of the opposition was included, but he has the rank of a minister, and in any case the suggestion came not from him but from the government. In those times of stress, when the unemployed were becoming more and more numerous, each cabinet minister received an additional \$2,000 a year. That was done in view of the decrease that was to come this year. Last year hon. gentlemen opposite, who had figures showing that unemployment was continually increasing, said, "We must have foresight," but that was the only way they showed that foresight. They had foresight for their own interests; they increased their salaries by \$2,000. They had that in view; they saw these hard times ahead, and that was the reason for the increase, made under the guise of a special allowance, in order to induce the people to think the prices of cars were still very high. You can buy a new Ford car for about \$500, and you can buy four street car tickets for 25 cents. Any man can attend to his parliamentary duties on six street car tickets a day, and that would not amount to much. For \$100 a year any member of parliament or any cabinet minister can provide himself with the local transportation necessary to enable him to attend to all his duties. He can go to his office in the morning, go home for lunch, come back for the afternoon session, go home for dinner, come back for the evening session, and then go home to rest peacefully.

Last year the salary of a minister, including the indemnity, was \$14,000. This year it is still

\$14,000, plus a special allowance of \$2,000, which, if my arithmetic is correct, makes \$16,000. If we take 10 per cent from that, he is still left with \$400 more than he received last year. Members of the house lose 10 per cent of their indemnity, or \$400, and in this way we pay for the increase received by the cabinet ministers. I do not complain about the cut, but I think everything should be fair and that we should be all on the same footing. I should be on the same footing as a civil servant whose salary is reduced, and the ministers should be on the same footing as myself. They have larger salaries; that is only fair, but I am strongly against that special allowance. I am ready to accept a cut in my indemnity provided the government understands that throughout the country there is a general feeling of indignation because the special allowance remains while all salaries are cut.

That is not the only point I wish to make. In the estimates for 1930 very few increases were made, while last year there were increases amounting to thousands of dollars. Look at the estimates of last year and the estimates of 1930. There were discriminatory exceptions, and those discriminations should disappear before any cut is made. Everyone should be on the same basis, the Tories and the Grits, the poor and the rich. Then no one can complain; but if those who receive the most still get more than others and are left untouched by the cut, there will be a strong feeling of indignation throughout this country from ocean to ocean. People will ask, "Where is the fairness of a government which serves itself and does not give the poor labourers a chance?"

Mr. RALSTON: I should like to ask the minister whether or not there has been any recommendation from the Civil Service Commission covering the 10 per cent reduction which is suggested by this and other items?

Mr. STEVENS: Speaking for my own department, I should say no.

Mr. RALSTON: Has there been any order in council passed reducing the salaries and the classification referred to in this item?

Mr. STEVENS: So far as I know there has not been any such order in council.

Mr. RALSTON: Then, Mr. Chairman, the situation is this: We have the government taking no action whatever up to the present to change the salaries of the civil servants. Salaries of civil servants are fixed by statute, as I understand it, first as provided in the Civil Service Act, and secondly on a recommendation of the Civil Service Commission