

cost any time in the last fifteen years. I am not saying that, if possible, the cost should not be reduced. But when our hon. friends opposite say that there was open to them only one of two alternative courses, either to keep on the statutory increases without looking at the merits of each case at all, which they say has been the prevailing practice, or to sweep them away entirely, or to put them under the will of the Minister, I say they have not rightly stated the question. There was another course open to them, that was, to adhere to the spirit of the law as passed by Parliament, and to apply the safeguards which would make it imperative upon every Deputy Minister to place before his Minister the record of his department for the preceding year, on which the Minister, acting on his responsibility, would decide. I have no hesitation in saying that there has been laxity in this respect—that Deputy Ministers thought they should not look into the record at all, but should just recommend the increases as a matter of course. All Deputy Ministers did not do that; some were careful not to do it. I know that there were cases in my own department in which the statutory increases were kept back simply on account of lapses and lax conduct on the part of certain officers. There is where hon. gentlemen could apply the safeguards in carrying on departmental service. That was another alternative; but my hon. friends did not take that, or give the statutory increases as a matter of right, but they took the alternative of sweeping away all statutory increases, and substituting what? The law or will of Parliament? No, but the absolute and arbitrary will of the Minister of the department. Our civil service are not simply the dregs of the community; they are not simply third-class men. They are men of education, men of spirit, men of honourable instincts; they have feelings just as much as we members of Parliament have. In the course you are taking you are introducing the feeling amongst them that if they are to get anything more than they are getting to-day, they have to get it through political favour—nothing else. My hon. friend may shake his head as much as he likes; but he knows in his heart as well as I know, that the moment the Minister of the Interior promulgated this doctrine and he followed it, that moment they opened the door to his party followers to use their influence with Ministers to obtain promotions for certain individuals. My hon. friend may have the stiffest of backbones; but political influence is political influence, and he and every other Minister will yield to it. But beyond that there is the demoralizing effect upon the civil service, in the feeling entertained by every civil servant to-day, that if he is to get the \$50 increase for himself and his family, he has no other way of getting it than by currying favour with the politicians or

Mr. FOSTER.

otherwise securing the good-will of his Minister. My hon. friend is unfair in a heated partisan discussion; but we are not having a heated partisan discussion. My hon. friend is a fair man now and he knows that there are men of great worth and great ability in his department who have been a long time there, and who are not in receipt of high salaries. Those men see that four men are selected by another Minister for advance in their salaries—one \$250, another \$200, and two others \$100 each; and he says to himself: Why am I left out? From the 1st of July to the 1st of July I have done my duty in my office, and my conscience is clear; yet my \$50 is refused to me. The man whom I have in my mind is as good as any man who has received these high increases. Take Mr. Rothwell, who has received an increase of \$250. Did he do his work before? The Minister says he did it, and did it well. Will he do anything more than his work now, and do it well? No. But where is he to-day? Made a chief clerk at the will of his Minister and \$250 added to his salary, while others have remained as first-class clerks without any addition to their salary, who are in every respect just as painstaking, steady and worthy members of the service—without saying anything against Mr. Rothwell at all—as Mr. Rothwell is. But from this moment out, there is no feeling of independence in the civil service. There is no feeling that they are to be treated on their merits. Every civil servant knows what partisanship is in this country. Every civil servant has heard it enunciated from the front benches here that an offensive partisan should be dismissed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. An active partisan.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that an active partisan should be put out, and the spirit is encouraged everywhere throughout this country that those in power for the time being, put there by their friends, must give consideration to their friends. We might as well acknowledge that, we know it is so, and I tell you, Sir, it will be practically impossible for anything but political influence to have weight in making up the sum of the reasons that will influence a Minister's decision. For the Minister himself it is a bad place to be put in. In future, those who have influence with him will approach him and say: We want such a man increased, he is a real good fellow, and his father and family have always voted for us, and the Minister will be at a loss for a reply. Formerly he could have said: There is the law, this man has done his work, and he will get \$50 per year increase until he reaches his maximum. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce says there is no way of rewarding a man. There is. The reward comes when a man has reached his maximum, and a Minister exercises his power of recom-