

tion to decide, whether a man is entitled to an increase of salary or to a larger salary than the automatic action of the Civil Service Act. I give my opinion for what it is worth; that it is not conducive to the efficiency of the service, that every man who is in the service shall know that he is going to get \$50 a year increase whether he is efficient or not. It is not conducive to efficiency that there should be no special recognition of merit, or ability, or diligence. As the hon. gentleman well knows, practically, for some years past, the \$50 a year increase has been almost automatic. In fact, it is rather a fine point of law as to whether the Civil Service Act contemplates that there should be any discretion about it or not. The civil servants themselves think there is none, but the conclusion of the Government is, that they would not give the increase unless it is specially considered that the civil servant earned it. We considered it to be more in the interest of the efficient work of the departments, that the Ministers should exercise discretion in regard to increasing salaries, rather than that it should be entirely automatic, and that officers should get increases whether they were efficient or not.

Mr. SPROULE. It is at least pleasing to know that the hon. gentleman does not agree with his friends when they were in power before, because, if my memory is correct, they were the parties who adopted the principle of the statutory increase, and it has been acted upon ever since. But it is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should have selected for promotion the two clerks he has selected, because, if my memory is not at fault, these two clerks were the subject of considerable controversy in this House a few years ago, and his friends behind him moved a vote of want of confidence in the Government because these same two clerks were not dismissed on account of certain irregularities which came out in 1891.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Which two clerks?

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Henry and Mr. Rothwell. There was a very long and very heated discussion over the matter in this House, and some very hard strictures were passed upon the Government because they did not dismiss these two men on account of the irregularities which were carried on in the department with their knowledge and consent; and now these same two men are selected for promotion. It is at least a justification of the late Government for what they did not do.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Would the hon. gentleman be more specific in regard to what these men were guilty of?

Mr. SPROULE. I could by bringing in the report of the Public Accounts Committee.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think the hon. gentleman is putting that matter fairly. The gentlemen who sat in the Opposition did not all agree that Mr. Henry should be dismissed. On the contrary, if he will turn back to the debates, he will find that Mr. Henry's conduct was defended by some gentlemen of the Opposition. I defended it myself.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say all of the hon. gentleman's friends did so, but I take it the majority did.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have some remembrance of the investigations which took place in reference to the Department of the Interior in 1891, and the conduct of Mr. Henry and Mr. Rothwell was such as to meet with the approbation instead of the disapproval of the committee. Mr. Rothwell came before the committee and gave his evidence in a straightforward, manly manner, and so did Mr. Henry. I do not think any reflection was cast on either in the committee or in this House. These two men were exempt from the criticisms of the committee, for the simple reason that they acted in a straightforward, honourable manner in giving their evidence, and no charge was brought against them that was sustained in any way whatever. I think they deserve credit for their conduct, and I am satisfied that in the discussion which took place in this House, neither Mr. Henry nor Mr. Rothwell met with the censure of any gentleman in the Opposition at that time.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the hon. gentleman must have a very bad memory. If he takes the trouble to look up "Hansard" he will see that he is entirely astray. I do not say that these gentlemen are worthy of condemnation, because we defended their conduct at that time. What I say is that the very fact that they are selected for promotion and an advance of salary is a justification of the late Government in defending them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is unfortunate, if my hon. friend entertains that opinion about these gentlemen, that he should have mentioned their names in the terms he has; for every one who heard him would supposed that he disapproved of the promotion of these gentlemen because of what happened in 1891. I do not remember very much about Mr. Rothwell, but I do remember that when Mr. Henry's name was under discussion here, it was shown that he had been very unfairly treated. What he had done was perhaps technically open to condemnation, but he had done it in obedience to his superior officer; and when his superior officer asked him to commit a like offence, he objected, and in consequence he has incurred the enmity of that officer from that time to this. So I am glad that the hon. gentleman has stated that he does not mean by the observation he has made to