

**MR. HOLTON'S AMENDMENT**

**Mr. Speaker** then gave his decision on the objection raised by Mr. Dunkin to Mr. Holton's motion. He decided that the motion was quite regular—That it was a complex motion. It was not therefore irregular.

**Hon. Mr. Rose** spoke in opposition to Mr. Holton's amendment. He referred to an erasure from the motion as originally drawn, which was aimed at reducing the salaries of ministers of the crown to \$4,000. The honourable gentleman, however, carefully looking at all contingencies, had decided to protect the present occupants for the sake of the incoming tenants. (Laughter.) But his honourable friend striking that out levelled his artillery at the Governor-General above, and at a lower game below, by proposing to strike off 12½ per cent from the salaries of officers receiving over \$800. If the salaries of Civil Service men were too high, he wished the House to consider that they had their salaries fixed by an Act of Parliament. The officers under that Act had reached certain positions after various terms of service, and the proposition was, that without any discrimination—without any inquiry as to the value of their services—they should be subjected to a reduction of at least 12½ per cent.

**Mr. Jones** (Leeds) asked if they had their salaries under an Act of the Dominion Parliament.

**Hon. Mr. Rose** said whether that were so or not, many of these men had grown gray in the public service, and were entitled to more consideration than this motion gave them. There was now a Civil Service Bill providing that men should enter the service at lower salaries than at present, and that they should get promotion according to a certain scale of length of service. At the same time Government had a certain discretion to adapt the salaries to the value of the officers. But this motion showed no such discretion, but proposed a general reduction without any reference to the value of the services rendered. Mr. Rose proceeded to contend that the officers in the Civil Service were not overpaid, and read some figures to show that they were not so well paid as the corresponding officers in the Legislature. He asked the House to pause before taking out of the hands of the Government the task in which they were now engaged of revising the whole civil service, and carefully adjusting the remuneration to the value of services. He would go as

far as any man for retrenchment and economy. At the same time he thought it of essential importance to the efficiency of the public service that the Government should have the power of dealing justly with these officers who devoted themselves to their work with the highest degree of industry, integrity, and zeal. As regarded the last proposition in the motion, it was merely a slavish copy of a part of the Civil Service Bill which the Government had now before the House. It was somewhat extraordinary that the honourable gentleman should propose to stop the supplies in order to forestall and anticipate what the Government were asking the House to enact.

**Mr. Chamberlin** regretted that the Minister of Finance had not argued as ably the absurdity of a general indiscriminate reduction of 12½ per cent when applied to the employees of this House, as he did now when applied to the employees of the Government. The motion of the member for Chateauguay divided itself into three parts, and each of them was bad. If the Governor-General were an officer of the Dominion, his salary should be exorbitant; but he was an officer of the Imperial Government, and when we gave back to Britain, in return for all the benefits we received from her, only this one salary, we should not quarrel about its amount. It might, perhaps, be advisable to reduce it, but the reduction to \$35,000 was decidedly too great. The second part of the motion was mischievous and absurd. The third part was needless, being simply a copy of an enactment which Government had at present before Parliament.

**Hon. Mr. Dorion** said that it would be a reflection on the officers of this House if the officers of departments were not similarly reduced. The present motion was an expression that the scale of salaries was too high and should be reduced at least 12½ per cent. It was only carrying out the views enunciated by the Government in regard to the officers of this House and should be literally followed up. The honourable Minister of Finance had not, when referring to the Governor's salary, shown any disposition to reduce it. From that it was evident the Government did not contemplate economy in this matter. He compared the salaries allowed under the old Civil Service Bill with those of the new, and stated that they went \$200 higher in the new.

**Mr. Young** went for retrenchment in the several branches of the public service. He