

position. My reason for this is not because I have any serious criticism to offer of the routine work performed by the Deputy Minister. Because of his long service in the department he probably knows more about the details of the administration end of it than any other man would know or could know. There is another question, though, that comes into it, and that is the development of modern finance: I doubt very much whether the Deputy Minister of Finance has had the time to make himself as conversant—I will be as kind as I can—with the recent changes in international as well as national finance that the present development of Canada would require. But my principal reason for raising the question at this time is briefly this: Canada is a young nation with a small population and ever-growing expenses, yet we have an excessive deputy-minister salary roll. I have taken the trouble to make some computations, and I find that there are some thirty-six deputies in Canada, running to a cost of \$173,500 per year. The additional list of those officials who hold the rank of deputy adds to that the sum of \$104,000, or a total of \$277,500. In the United States twenty-one men in the service hold the rank of deputy minister, with a total salary of \$157,500, an average of about \$7,500 each. In summary, Canada has thirty-six deputies, including those holding the rank of deputy, at a total salary of \$277,500, or \$30,833 per million of population, while the United States has twenty-one, at a total cost of \$157,500, or only \$1,432 per million of population, a ratio of about thirty to one in favour of the United States in economy. I will admit that arguments can easily be adduced by the minister and others to explain why that should be, but I simply place these figures on Hansard so that the minister will be in a position to resist any further pressure for an increased salary list of deputy ministers or for advancing any more officials to the rank of deputy.

Mr. GOOD: I would like to discuss the question of the deputy ministership, but I do not know whether or not it comes under this item. It has already been discussed to some extent, and with the minister's permission, I should like to say something more.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcell Bonaventure): A reference to the subject may be made, but an extended discussion of it would not be in order.

Mr. GOOD: If there is to be another opportunity, I will await until that time.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

To provide for the salary of Walter Duncan at \$2,550 per annum, as a special investigating officer under the direction of the Department of Finance, with the power to administer oaths in the performance of his duties, and also to provide for contingent expenses of this service, a further sum of \$5,050.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What was this gentleman's business last year?

Mr. ROBB: I do not like to refuse my hon. friends anything, but I do refuse to say what this gentleman's business was last year. I may say it was very profitable to the country.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—unforeseen expenses, expenditure thereof to be under order in council, and a detailed statement to be laid before parliament within fifteen days of next session, \$60,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is "miscellaneous" enough. Can the minister identify it?

Mr. ROBB: It is the usual vote. There is a reduction of \$15,000. Up to February 20, 1925, we spent last year \$57,323.48. A statement of details is tabled at the beginning of every session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the minister the statement there?

Mr. ROBB: No, but I can get it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the minister had better hold the item until we get it.

Mr. ROBB: This vote has been there for many years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know, but each year we get a statement of what it has been applied to. What is it mostly intended to be applied to this year?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend should know there were expenditures under this item during his term of office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never spent any of it.

Mr. ROBB: Somebody spent \$34,801.75, in 1921-22, and \$36,150.25 in 1920-21.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is just about half this amount.

Mr. ROBB: I notice it is continually growing. The expenditure has been as follows:

1910-11..	\$12,629 18
1913-14..	14,691 30
1919-20..	23,982 24
1920-21..	36,150 25
1921-22..	34,801 75
1922-23..	51,926 26
1923-24..	35,515 62

If the information to which my right hon. friend referred has not been tabled, I will see that that is done.