

question of a grain standard. When I raised the question in the early part of the session, the hon. gentleman assured me that he intended to consider it, and that he would have a scheme forthcoming that would present a better solution of what I admit is a complex and difficult question. I am surprised to hear him say now that he considers the arrangement made for the grain standard last year as final.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have not the remotest idea who Mr. Baker is. The hon. gentleman does not appear to have any reason to complain of the way in which the standard was made up at Winnipeg, only he complains that Mr. Baker is not on the board. Well, I did the best I could to make a representative board by making it one-half of farmers, and the other half representatives of the millers and dealers. I thought it was only fair to give a large representation to the farming community who are really the producers of the wheat. I am wholly at a loss to understand at this moment why my hon. friend complains of the composition of that part of the board which represents the farming interests, that is to say, one-half of the board. Since this session began, I have received a large deputation of gentlemen interested in this very same question, but I do not remember that my hon. friend accompanied that deputation, though I know that nearly all the western members were there. We had a thorough consultation of the whole question, and I may say that the only cause of complaint I could learn was, not in settling the standard of the grain, but in the way grades of grain are mixed after it had been inspected. We all found there was a great difficulty in preventing that, when once the grain leaves the elevators, or when it is put on board ship after being inspected, or when not inspected at all. There is certainly a very difficult question to deal with in order to keep up the reputation of the grain by preventing that mixture. But even that meeting of representative men was not able to suggest any remedy.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course that is part of the question. But my hon. friend will recollect what he used to say to me in 1896 when I went to him and asked him in regard to the constitution of that board, he would say to me: Go and speak to so and so—as if an irresponsible member of this House was the master of his department.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I hope my hon. friend will not think I am wanting in courtesy. What I told my hon. friend probably was to this effect, that he was equally interested with the other western members representing the farming community, and they should be able to agree about the composition of the board to the satisfaction of themselves and the public.

Mr. DAVIN. I am afraid my hon. friend has forgotten what took place. I went to him three times in regard to one matter, which was a subject of public importance. In each case he mentioned that I had better go and speak to some other member, naming him, which I of course would not do. We are not fresh from an election and there is no prospect of a by-election, so the hon. gentleman will probably feel more free than he was in 1896, and I urge on him to consider whether a representative cannot be placed on the board from Western Assiniboia, and I cannot name a better representative or one who will commend himself more to the support of men on all sides than T. B. Baker.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to point out an anomaly that occurs with respect to the Inland Revenue Act. In 1891 section 31 was substituted for section 130 of the Act. That was repealed and another section was substituted by the Act of 1895. Then in 1897 the same thing was done. The Act of 1891 was repealed and another was substituted, but no notice was taken of the Act of 1895. So you have the Act of 1891 twice repealed, and the Act of 1897 repealed, but no notice is taken of the Act of 1895. Confusion might arise and it is desirable to remove this anomaly.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The Bill was carefully prepared, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will point out the section in question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will send a memorandum to the Minister.

Post Office—Outside Service—Increase of salaries of 105 letter carriers at \$30 each and 24 clerks at \$40 each..... \$4,110

Mr. FOSTER. I desire an explanation of these increases.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). These increases apply to all these servants who have salaries less than \$450 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. What was their former status?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The increase is \$30 a year, and this will bring them up to \$480.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not this practically giving the statutory increases to these clerks?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know whether it could be called statutory, but we are giving each of these servants \$30. This increase is given to those having a salary of \$450.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman adopting the principle that this increase may be given, but for the time being it will be limited to a certain range of salary?