

generally sustained in the steps they take. I trust this memorialist will not present his claim in vain, and that steps will be taken between this and next meeting of Parliament to give him redress.

Mr. BOWELL. As to the information asked for by the hon. leader of the Opposition, the accounts are not in such a state as to be able to give it in detail. There are some eleven or twelve clerks and employés of the Department who have been doing portions of the extra work and have been paid at the rate of \$2 per every five hours' service performed under the supervision of one of the clerks of the Department. A portion of this amount is for printing circulars and clerical labor. As to Mr. Ogden, he has been employed in Nova Scotia adjusting certain accounts and investigating claims that had been made, the correctness of which the Department had some doubts. The same work is being performed in New Brunswick by Mr. Harrington, who is an employé of the Department. The services of all these officers have also been utilized in connection with the distribution of the fishery bounty, and in procuring the fish and other articles that have been sent to the exhibition in London. This statement also refers to adjusting accounts and procuring exhibits for the exhibition. Mr. Rogers and Mr. Johnston, of Nova Scotia, have been employed; the former has expended \$950, and the latter \$700. In Quebec Mr. Wakeham is employed, and in Prince Edward Island, Mr. Duval. Mr. Ogden up to the present time has expended \$490; Mr. Honeyman, for Nova Scotia, has expended \$200; Mr. Gregory, Quebec, \$1,500; Mr. Andrews, British Columbia, \$1,100. Professor Macoun was also employed in procuring fish food for the exhibition.

Mr. BLAKE. I see there are fourteen clerks in the Department employed for extra services in connection with this matter. It was a new matter entirely, and I hardly understand the ground upon which the hon. gentleman says it was important in the public interest they should be employed for that extra work. I do not mean to say that if the Department is overworked, or when extra pressure comes upon it, that it may not be necessary to employ extra services; but if that be so, it seems to me there has been a needless and unwarrantable violation of the Civil Service Act, which prescribes that clerks in a Department shall not be employed for extra services in that particular Department. This work could very well have been attended to by other persons employed for that purpose. The sums may not be important, but the principle is, and I am sorry that at a period when we are regulating our Civil Service Act, and adopting the most virtuous resolutions, the hon. gentleman should propose to violate one of the most wholesome clauses of this Act in this manner.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not so understand the Civil Service Act. That Act provides that clerks employed at a regular salary shall not be paid for extra work, unless the sum be voted distinctly by Parliament. It is well known that for a number of years past that the practice of employing clerks and paying them large sums in addition to their salary was the reason for introducing that clause into the Civil Service Act. In almost every Department there were very large sums paid to clerks in violation of the law as it then existed. Since the present Act has been passed, when it has been necessary to employ any extra service, it has not been paid to him out of the contingencies of the Department, but a special vote has been placed in the Estimates to cover it, in order that Parliament might know in every instance where a clerk had been employed, the services he had performed and the amount that was to be paid to him, which was not the case under the old law. If a clerk now receiving a salary is worked over hours he cannot be paid under the law as I have indicated, but it has to be brought before Parliament. I do not therefore consider this is a violation of the Civil Service Act, for the reason that Parliament knows every dollar that is

Mr. PAINT.

paid to an extra clerk. I cannot understand that it was the intention of Parliament to prevent the services of a clerk being utilised when he was required in any special work in that Department; but it did make this provision, that if he is so employed, his salary is not to be supplemented out of any vote granted by Parliament for other purposes, hence the necessity for coming down to Parliament in every instance with a specific sum to cover these particular items. In this case I am informed by those upon whom the responsibility rest in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that they found it both easier and better to adopt this system, and to utilize clerks who had had experience in the Department, and that it would cost much less to employ them in this manner, than to bring in other clerks into the Department. Had new clerks been brought into the Department, they would have had to undergo a certain education, and be taught either by the Deputy Head or the chief clerks, at a loss of time to these latter officers. I am also informed that had the Department brought into the offices this number of clerks to perform this work, there would not have been rooms in which to place them.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I agree with what has been said by the leader of the Opposition, that this expenditure is entirely uncalled for, and if money is to be wasted and salaries paid for extra services, there are plenty of works in connection with the fisheries of Nova Scotia, where it could be spent with better advantage. When the hon. Finance Minister made his Budget Speech last year, he stated that it was the intention of the Government to provide \$150,000 for the purpose of paying bounties to fishermen. Nearly seven months elapsed before any steps were taken, and it was not until 7th November, 1882, that the hon. gentleman made any statement in connection with this matter. It was not until 4th December that it was heard from again, and not until 18th December were any steps taken to collect information as to the proper persons to receive the bounty. A circular was issued on that date, addressed to the Collectors of Customs in Nova Scotia and other parts of Canada. These returns could not be obtained until January or February, and it was scarcely a matter of surprise that extra clerks were necessary, at that late date, to examine claims and prepare cheques. If the Department had given their attention to the matter two or three months earlier this expenditure would have been unnecessary. With respect to the appointment of Mr. Ogden: I understand he has been appointed for the purpose of making enquiries into disputed claims in connection with the fisheries of Nova Scotia. There are, however, a sufficient number of officers to look after those fisheries and to represent the Department, without extra men being appointed. There is Mr. Johnson, the head of the Department of Nova Scotia; Mr. Rogers, Inspector of Fisheries; and deputies and inspectors of fish in almost every county. I think in one county, that of Guysborough, there are no less than twenty-five inspectors and deputy-inspectors representing the Department.

Mr. BOWELL. Some of these men receive only \$30 a year.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). They are appointed to perform certain duties and there are plenty of others willing to take their places. Then there are the Collectors of Customs. These collectors were instructed to examine into the claims. The acting Minister has stated that Mr. Ogden was appointed to collect fish for the London exhibition; but Dr. Honeyman, a most valuable officer, and one who has been connected with exhibitions since 1862, was also engaged in that work, and could do it most successfully, and to far better advantage. This vote for extra clerks is entirely due to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine having neglected to perform their duty