whom it cannot touch and whose steadfast and contented work is essential to the efficiency of the public service.

The salary question is the most frequent ground of difference between employers and employed. The Canadian law has recognized the danger to industrial peace involved in this in a way that is wholly unique. Under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, passed in 1906, whenever any difference arises between an employer and his workmen, in an industry which directly serves the public, the matter must be referred for adjustment to a board appointed under the Act. The parties to the dispute need not accept the findings of the board, but if they do not they must face the disapproval of public opinion. The government itself has on at least one occasion referred a difference of its own with the I.C.R. employees for adjustment under this measure, and has cheerfully accepted an award involving an increase in wages. It is less than two months since a substantial increase was granted to over 600 telegraphers along the system of the I.C.R. in recognition of the upward trend of wages, and the increase is an example only of what has happened in every branch of this department within two or three years past. So careful, indeed, is the Canadian law to recognize the right of the labourer to a living wage that a schedule of fair wages must be included as a specification in every contract that is awarded by the government, and two officers of the Department of Labour are constantly employed in the preparation of these schedules and the enforcement of the principle that when a man, however indirectly, is employed by the country he shall not be sweated or paid less than the current market price of his labour. Now, why should this protection extend only to the man who works with his hands and whose work in some cases brings him a greater reward than that of the lower-paid civil servant? A principle is a principle, and the Royal Commission on the civil service should carry no less weight than a Board of Arbitration under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act on the claims of, say, the Halifax freight handlers.

It is true, of course, that the civil service is not a unit in the sense that a body of skilled labourers are when employed on a particular piece of work. It is true also that under the old methods of appointment and promotion marked inequalities in desert obtain as between individual civil servants. But that does not render the problem of giving relief insoluble. The service does not ask to be dealt with as a unit. It will be perfectly content if the plain instructions of the commission are carried out and the deserving only selected for treatment which, after all, under the circumstances, means only that to the man who has maintained his efficiency the country will maintain the schedule of pay at which it first engaged him. This is no herculean task. If in the last resort the reorganization of the service were impartially effected on the definite understanding that allowance was to be made in the act of transfer for the changed conditions of living it would allay a great deal of the unrest. To ask for more than this would be to depart from that perfect understanding of the relation of the question to the public interests which has been conspicuously shown at every stage of the representations made on behalf of the service to the government.

We come at the last to the real difficulty of the proposed salary adjustment—the cost of it to the country. To give 10% to the inside service alone would need over $370,000. The outside service would require a considerably larger sum. These are grave expenditures to contemplate. But as they seem to offer the most serious argument against the increase,