

thought these men were entitled to a higher salary, but they could not give it to them without a vote of Parliament, as we could not do so under the law. The law allowed us to give these officers only the minimum salary of \$700, and as we desired to give them more, we have come to Parliament for a special vote. The Government have found that these officers, from their qualifications and the work they were doing, deserve a higher salary than we could give them under the provisions of the Act, and Parliament, being above the Act, is the only authority that can give them this increase; therefore, we are not at all violating the law. If we gave them the minimum salary of another class, we would have to give them a much higher salary than we propose to give them here, and more than they are entitled to. When we found that the Auditor-General would not allow these increases to be paid because it was against the Statute, we came to Parliament for a special vote.

M. BLAKE. Of course, the hon. gentleman did not violate the law, because the Auditor-General stood in the way of its violation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. We wished to give these men the same salary as the officers of the same class and qualifications had. The Auditor-General said: "We cannot do that because it is against the Statute;" and the Auditor-General is here exactly for that purpose, to see that there is no addition to any salary which is not authorized by Statute. Therefore we come to Parliament and ask for the desired increase.

Mr. BLAKE. What I complain of is that you establish one Session a standard of salaries, a system for the whole service, and propose the following Session to alter that plan, both with reference to the number of offices that you have appointed and with reference to the salaries provided for under the Civil Service Act for persons of that rank. Thus you are practically altering and modifying the law in a manner which renders its provisions nugatory. I see two or three of these clerks were appointed on 30th June last, at \$700; that was the salary which was thought fit to appoint them at. Now, I see that from January last up to the next June, it is proposed to take a vote for \$300 more for the man who was appointed at \$700 and served six months at \$700. Now, I say here is a proposal advancing far beyond the provisions of the Civil Service Act which prescribed the first appointment at \$700 and a gradual increase.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With respect to the four third class clerks from 1st March to 30th June, at \$750 per annum, the hon. gentleman would remember that, under the Civil Service Act as it stands now, the minimum salary for that class is \$450, but the law says that the salaries may go up to \$1,000. If we require a third class clerk with special qualifications, who is not a mere copyist, who has qualifications that would fit him in a higher class, he deserves more salary than you can give him in that class, but you come to Parliament to get authority to pay him a higher salary than the Act allows in that class.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that perfectly, but I say that the general scale provided by the Act is being departed from entirely in these proposals. It is not among the high class clerks, who have become valuable, but it is in the lowest class, and almost immediately after their introduction to the service, that it is proposed to depart from the Statute.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The rule is well observed in the Departments. The hon. gentleman will recollect that we had two classes, a junior second class and a senior second class, instead of which we have now a third class, which may go up to \$1,000, while the minimum is \$400. Such clerks will not come into the service at \$400, and must be paid a higher salary. Instead of placing them in the

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

second class and giving them \$1,100, we ask that they shall be placed between \$400 and \$1,000, the maximum of the third class.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I observe by the statement of the hon. First Minister that some officers have been promoted from other branches of the service to that of the Department of the Interior. The Civil Service Act provides that in the event of promotions being so made they should take place only after examination. By this system of transfer an officer may be able to obtain a larger advance than he would have done if he remained in the Department in which he was employed; but I do not know that this has taken place in these cases. I am exceedingly anxious that we should observe very strictly the provisions of the Civil Service Act. It is of the first importance that this should be done, otherwise we will demoralize the service and do what the Minister of Public Works mentioned the other day—place Ministers at the mercy of officers in the Departments and their friends, to be importuned for increases whether the officers are meritorious or not. The Minister of Public Works mentioned that, although the Department could not make such increases, Parliament may do so. The Government have no right to come to Parliament and ask it to violate the Civil Service Act, and to ask it to do what they are not willing to do themselves. I am not objecting to these proposed advances, for some of the officers, speaking from what I know of some of them, are deserving of the increase; but it is given in violation of the law, and will form a precedent which will give Ministers themselves much trouble.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What is proposed is according to law and not a violation of it, because the law says that no higher salary than the amount specified shall be given to the officer unless voted by Parliament. In this case a number of officers were taken from other Departments where they had shown ability and capacity, and transferred to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). At higher salaries.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; we could not give them without Parliament voting them. We now come to Parliament and say that these officers are required, and that the work requires men possessing more ability than that of mere clerks, and we therefore ask the House to vote the necessary money.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). How many are new appointments?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Burgess was in the Department, and an increase is proposed. Mr. Hall was in the Department of Justice; Mr. Pope, in the Marine and Fisheries Department; Mr. Wallis, in the Post Office Department; Mr. Pereira is a new appointment; Mr. Chisholm was in the Department of Marine and Fisheries; Mr. Brough was in the Inland Revenue Department, receiving \$850 a year. He was transferred and only paid \$700, and this is an increase to his salary. Mr. Bonfellow, draughtsman, and clerk, and Dominion Land Surveyor, was specially appointed to look after the business of Colonization Lands. He was not in the Department before. Mr. Billings, Mr. Brooke and Mr. Sherwood were in the Department. Mr. Ardouin is a new appointment. Two third class clerks at \$400, and three third class clerks at \$600, and four third class clerks at \$750 are all required in the Department. This is a thorough reorganization of the Department for the purpose of making it efficient. It is of the highest importance that at this time the work should be thoroughly and speedily done with as few errors as possible, and it would be false economy to secure inferior men with a view to saving a few dollars. We do not want untried men, but men who understand their business, and who can at once enter on their work the moment they put their foot in the Departments, and per-