

Mr. EMMERSON. To \$500.

Mr. FOSTER. The amount is \$600.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and I propose to give him \$500 of that \$600. Provision is made for \$250 here. I think it is \$1,650 plus \$250, equals \$1,900 and this plus \$500 equals \$2,400. Under the present arrangement he will be getting \$2,300 if he were to continue to get the whole allowance of a private secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he a first-class clerk now?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the maximum of a first-class clerkship?

Mr. EMMERSON. \$1,900.

Mr. FOSTER. What objection has the minister to letting him go on with his increases in the first-class clerkship? He has quite a road to travel there, there is still nearly \$300 for him to get in that way and you could pay him his secretary's allowance of \$600. What is the necessity for this? It is much the same as what the Minister of Agriculture has done. He took a man who had been only eight years in the service and made him chief clerk and gives him besides his allowance as private secretary.

Mr. FISHER. One half of it.

Mr. FOSTER. This man has been in the department eleven years.

Mr. EMMERSON. Twelve years.

Mr. FOSTER. Well twelve years. You are putting him up \$350 in his class and then raising him to a grade higher. This is most extraordinary promotion. What is the necessity for making him a chief clerk? The minister does not expect to go out and leave him unprovided for. The government expect to remain in power a few years yet. Why then do you make him this year a chief clerk when he has still \$350 to work out in his first-class clerkship? And besides that you give him the work of a private secretary, which does not leave him many spare moments.

Mr. EMMERSON. By reason of his experience and ability and knowledge, Mr. Payne is entitled to this increase. He is a very busy man. He has not the spare hours that are usually allotted to civil servants. From the earliest hour in the morning until the very latest at night, even during the hours this House is sitting, he is occupied.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the necessity for another chief clerk in the department? You say that because he is efficient and a faithful servant you make him a chief clerk. You do this in order to remunerate him. But he receives a salary as private secretary of the minister besides receives the salary of a first-class clerk, which is all the department requires. But in order further to re-

Mr. U. WILSON.

munerate him, without showing that there is any necessity for another chief clerk in the department, you create him chief clerk. That seems to me curious logic. The law requires that the minister should first of all have a certificate from the deputy minister that another chief clerk is required. That is submitted to the Governor General in Council, and when you get their approval you ask for the vote.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend has omitted to say that before the certificate from the deputy minister is received and before the Order in Council is passed, you must have a vote by parliament. Mr. Payne is doing the work of a chief clerk. His duties require him to do work which certainly could only be required of one who has the qualifications for a chief clerkship. As private secretary of the minister, he has not merely to attend to correspondence, but the carrying out a number of transactions in connection with the department which are of a class that call for the qualifications of a chief clerk. As he does that kind of work, it seems to me that he ought to receive the pay it is worth. What we are doing is only fair and just and what has been done in the past, and is only a fair recognition of merit.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says that first of all, before he can change the theoretical organization of his department, he has to get the vote of parliament. I differ from him entirely. First of all he should have a certificate from the deputy minister showing the necessity for another chief clerk, and that should have the approval of the Governor General in Council. Then you get your vote for the purpose of enabling you to carry out that change.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my hon. friend is in error.

Mr. FOSTER. This is no question of Mr. Payne's ability as clerk or private secretary, in both of which capacities he is a very capable man. Is the minister going to use Mr. Payne during the coming years as his private secretary?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I take this ground. He is to be continued as private secretary. That will take all his time. The minister's work is quite enough for one man to attend to in that respect. That is, you are not going to employ Mr. Payne in the least as a chief clerk in the department.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a clerical error there, which I will point out. I attempted to make it clear that incidental to his duties as private secretary there is work connected with the department which requires the qualifications of a chief clerk which is the work of a chief clerk, departmental work, which Mr. Payne, because of his experience and familiarity with