

cast any reflection upon either of these gentlemen.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not, but I say that they are most unfortunate cases to be selected for promotion.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not see the force of that statement, if these gentlemen were not deserving of censure. The mere fact that some persons called their names before the committee is no reason why they should not be promoted if they afford cases which justify the Minister in recommending their advance of salary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to say a word with reference to these gentlemen whose names are now before the committee; but I want to draw the attention of the committee to what I think is a very serious and important matter. It was the policy of different Governments, under the Civil Service Act, to add \$50 a year to the salaries of such clerks as performed their duties in such a way as to secure the recommendation of the head of the department for that increase, which was done on the report of the Deputy Minister, a gentleman who is not a political partisan, but a permanent official acting under all Governments. Not only have we that policy, introduced I am told—I do not remember myself—by hon. gentlemen opposite when in power before—

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No. I think it was in existence from 1867.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am right, at all events, in saying that it was the practice of the Liberal party when in power. It was a sound and salutary practice, provided it was properly carried out; and every assurance that it would be fairly and impartially carried out was implied in the fact that the statutory increase could not be obtained unless the deputy head certified that the official was entitled to it. Now, what has been done? It is declared that this practice has been swept away, and that the Minister of the Interior has adopted a policy of cutting off that statutory increase which under the law and practice of Parliament was awarded uniformly to all officials who performed their services in such a way as to obtain the recommendation of the deputy head, and has provided not only that the statutory increase shall be given to certain individuals, but that it may be doubled. Now, what is the position of all the rest of the civil service? The fact that you put the names of these two gentlemen in your estimates as entitled to double the statutory increase, and leave out the overwhelming body of the civil service, who under the law and practice were entitled to the increase of \$50, is a censure fastened upon the character and standing of every officer in the service who is not treated in the same manner. In my judgment, it is

Mr. McCARTHY.

opening the door to the grossest party favouritism. It is more than that: it is opening the door to the demoralization of the civil service by insulting all those gentlemen whose names do not appear. If the names of certain individuals are to be put before this House as entitled to consideration, then it follows that every man whose name is not put before the House in the same way is branded, as far as this Government can brand him, as inefficient, or as not so faithfully discharging his duties as to be entitled to that which all Governments have granted hitherto. I regard this as a most grave act, and open to the imputation of an attempt to introduce favouritism into the civil service, and to treat one official on a basis entirely different from that on which other members of the service are treated.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think the hon. gentleman has misunderstood entirely the probable results and the reasons for the action of the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope so.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is quite true that for a number of years an increase of \$50 per man, until the parties had reached the maximum of their class, has been granted, without question or dispute.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But granted upon the evidence of the Deputy Minister.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am quite aware of that. An abuse had sprung up, an abuse which existed in the hon. gentleman's time, which existed in my time, and after my time, and which there was danger of continuing to exist with great injury to the public service. For a long number of years it has come to pass that every soul in the civil service, good, bad or indifferent, every man who was not absolutely a subject for dismissal, got this increase of \$50, as a matter of statutory right. I submit that that was not the intention of the House, or the true intention of the statute, and not in the interest of the civil service. It is in the interest of the civil service that the men who have deserved this favour by their good conduct, should get it; but I think this matter should be regarded particularly with reference to the fact that our civil government expenditure has gone up by leaps and bounds from \$700,000 or \$800,000 in 1878 to about \$1,400,000 in the present year, and that apart from the very large augmentation in the amount of superannuation charges, I think we are paying more for the civil service of Canada than our income warrants. We might, and possibly ought to have taken a different line; we might, and possibly ought to have dispensed with the services of a very large number of these people; we might, and possibly ought, to have dismissed 300 or 400 civil servants, but we did not do that, and