

we determined that, in the present state of the finances of the country, the sum of \$1,400,000 which, I think, was the vote asked for by the late Government, was all the country could stand for the civil service.

As a man of business, does not the hon. gentleman know that very nearly a million and a half of dollars is an enormous sum to pay for the civil service of a country like ours. It is more in proportion than is paid in the United States, taking their expenditure and revenue and population. It is more than is paid in England in proportion to their population, revenue and expenditure. I think it is our duty to keep that down, and the only way I can possibly hope to do so is by refusing to consider these statutory increases as a matter of course. If we are wrong in our law, it is for the hon. gentleman and others on that side to point out where we are wrong. Although it may be perfectly true that certain nominal checks were provided to be exercised by the deputy heads of departments, the hon. gentleman knows, as well as I, of what little use that check was. How often have I not risen and asked whether out of 200 or 300 employees in any department, it was possible that every mortal one of them should have deserved the statutory increase. And the hon. gentleman knows well that he told the House in reply that we had such an excellent service, we could not find a single man in it who did not deserve the statutory increase. He knows that the right of depriving them of the increase was not exercised and that the thing had become a regular abuse. There is not a banking or other institution which would have permitted this to go on as we have. The civil service at present, in proportion to the character and class of work done, is very largely paid, and overpaid in its lower branches. I never have contended that the higher officials were overpaid, and although it is rather foreign, perhaps, to the present discussion, I may say that it will be worth while, when we have time enough and the House has time enough to decide whether we ought not to revert to the English fashion which divides the civil service into two classes—the one confined to purely clerical work and the other having a very much larger scope and better salaries in proportion. I must tell the hon. gentleman that we cannot go on with these statutory increases over such a large service. It is on that ground, and not on the ground of desiring to insult the public service, that we have decided that, at present at least, we must bring these increases to a close.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where does the retrenchment come in in this department, when the expenditure is \$430 more than before?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the old rule had been applied, it would have been \$4,000 or \$5,000 more

that would have been asked for. There are about eighty-eight officials, and most of them would have been entitled to their \$50 increase under the old rule. Generally speaking, all these big departments had a large increase of several thousand dollars a year, accounted for by the statutory increases. There is an increase of \$400 which my hon. colleague endeavoured to explain. I think we should take the two departments together, and in the two will be found a considerable saving.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understand that. The hon. Minister wants to leave the impression that the present Government are economizing, but they are asking the House for \$430 more than they should, and they are putting into the hands of the heads of the departments, the dealing out of justice, as they see fit, and not according to law. I am prepared to support every attempt at economy, but I do not want hon. gentlemen opposite to tell me and this committee that they are going in for retrenchment when they are increasing the expenditure.

Mr. McNEILL. I think there is a great deal of force in what has been said by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce regarding the necessity for great economy in the civil service, but there are certain principles which ought to govern us and which we should not violate, even to secure economy. It does seem to me that if a number of gentlemen have been induced to enter the service on a certain understanding, and if over many years a certain practice has been followed in the service, whether strictly in conformity with the law or not—and every one who enters the civil service is not supposed to be really and practically very conversant as to whether the deputy heads of departments are construing the law as it ought to be or not—it is hardly fair to treat them now on a totally different footing. These gentlemen have been induced to enter the civil service on the understanding that they were entitled to certain statutory increases; and, while it may be right to say that those who enter the civil service hereafter shall not be entitled to that increase, I do think that we should maintain these principles of honour and justice, irrespective altogether of considerations of economy, which are required from honourable men and from an honourable Government. I think it is not a fair thing, I think it is a very unfair thing, to endeavour to secure economy by sacrificing these men in this way. It is all very well to say that you are going to make a saving in a certain department; it is all very well for the Minister of Interior (Mr. Sifton) to come down here and tell us, as he did a few moments ago: I do not approve of the Civil Service Act; I think it is a mistake not to give me the power to increase the salary of officials in my department; and, because I do not approve of the Act, I am going to do what I wish irrespec-