

motion, and you have introduced this man over their heads. You do not need any junior second-class grade in order to do that. You did it, you gave what excuse you had for it, you got your vote through, your followers supported you, and the House voted the money. I protest with all the earnestness possible against establishing an expensive grade of clerks or making the way for it. The moment you do it there is no limit, you will find that you will have to submit to the pressure of your followers, and before we know it we will have a large junior second-class grade built up. Where is all this talk that we heard so often about the burdens of the civil service? Where are those promises that told us in the good old days that the civil service burden could be reduced to one-third of what it was upon the hill of Ottawa? It was an absolute step in the way of diminishing the burden of the civil service when we substituted a grade that began with \$300 and worked up to \$600, for a grade that went from \$500 to \$1,000, and did just as efficient work. That is working itself out, and in the course of a dozen years from to-day you will find few third-class clerks, but you will have a class of writers, men and women who are doing the work at from \$300 to \$600 a year, and doing it just as well as it was done by a class of clerks getting from \$600 to \$1,000 a year. The new grade which you are creating will be filled up inevitably. Open up a junior second-class grade, and in the course of eight or ten years you will have it filled up with men and women who are doing the work of writers, and at a high class of salaries when you can get plenty of people who will do the work neatly and well for a much less salary. Where are all these protestations against the weight and burden of the civil service? Where is this consuming idea of lessening the burden and getting the people's work done for a fairly reasonable amount? There are Liberals, there is the present Finance Minister, there are gentlemen who sit behind him, there is my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) who, whether for good or ill, first put that notion of the writer class into my head by remarks which he himself made more than once as to the English system, and why we did not adopt it in this House. It was adopted and has worked well, and I must appeal to the hon. gentleman to come to my rescue now against his expensive and extravagant colleague the Minister of Finance and help me. He and I together! What a stroke of work we could do! By the way, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has not yet notified me if these envelopes are ready for our joint addresses to go out. I accepted the offer; I notify my hon. friend that I am ready now. I am ready to have my speech placed in the envelope alongside of his and circulated with it. It saves

handling and expense in the post office, and as both of our speeches will go they might as well go together as apart. I appeal to the House to pause before it puts an expensive, a useless and an unnecessary grade of civil servants upon the finances of the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has pointed out a good many things with which I quite agree in regard to the second-class clerkships which can be filled up. The hon. gentlemen, however, I think, has entirely missed the point and object of this Bill. He has pointed out that under his own direction the government of which he was a member did away with any further additions to the third-class clerkships, and substituted a class of writers, or temporary clerks, who are engaged from time to time, and who, although they have passed the civil service examination do not belong to the permanent civil service. It is for the purpose of enabling those who have shown aptitude and extraordinary diligence in their work to become members of the civil service and to reap the benefits of being in the permanent service, and to keep these people in the service rather than have them leave the service which we are finding is our experience, that this measure is proposed. The class of writers that the hon. gentleman brought into existence commence their service at \$400 a year. They are allowed a statutory increase of \$30 a year until they reach the maximum of \$600 a year. There are bright young men and women who will not enter the public service at all at \$400 a year, and if they do they will not stay in the public service after they have gained a few years' experience at only \$430, or \$460, or \$490 a year, as, by the terms of the class which the hon. gentleman created, they are only able to stay. They will not stay even for \$600 a year, and the result is that we are face to face with the dilemma that we either have to let those who are specially qualified for their work leave the service altogether or else make them second-class clerks at \$1,100 a year. My hon. friend would not, for a moment, suggest that it would be a proper thing to take young men or women who are at the head of the class of writers getting \$600 a year, and at one jump, and without any graduation at all, make them second-class clerks at \$1,100 a year. I am not speaking of where a vacancy occurs amongst the second-class clerks which has to be filled, but I am speaking of the case of a temporary clerk who is getting even \$600 a year, whose services are efficient, but who will not stay in the service at that rate of remuneration, and whom we cannot blame for that feeling, because such people are efficient, intelligent and capable enough to deserve a greater remuneration than \$600 a year.