

## SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

17. Department of Public Works.....\$41,430.00

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understood that the hon. Minister of Public Works was to explain what are the duties of the three additional second-class clerks, who are added to the engineering branch.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are engineers, connected with both the engineering branch and the architect's branch.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They are really assistant architects.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. These officers are doing work that has been going on for the last fifteen years, and they have been made permanent officers. If we find that it is better for the service, as well as for the individual, that a man should be made a permanent officer, we appoint him, although sometimes an officer prefers to remain on the outside service.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the hon. gentleman would call these officers assistant architects, or something that would indicate their duties, I think it would be better.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The difficulty is this: Very often when we give a title to an officer he is apt to consider himself in a higher position than he really is, and then he and his friends press for more salary for him. I think it would be better for the Head of the Department to be in a position to say that if an officer, by his good conduct and service, earns a title, after a while he should have it. For instance, I might call my hon. friend's attention to Mr. H. F. Perley, who was employed in his time, and is still employed. I had the position of Chief Engineer of the Department to give when the two Departments were divided, and I thought from what I knew and heard of that officer that he deserved to be promoted. I promoted him with the consent of my colleagues; and I must say that the experience I have had of Mr. Perley convinces me that he deserved that promotion. The only regret I had was that I could not ask for an increase of salary for that officer. He does his work with a great deal of zeal, and to the entire satisfaction of the Head of the Department, and I must say that his services are worth more salary than he receives, considering the salaries given to corresponding officers outside the Government. But Mr. Perley saw the difficulties in the way, and he has acquiesced, relying on the future to obtain, if Parliament will grant it, an increase of salary. I am very glad my hon. friend has given me this opportunity to pay that tribute to the Chief Engineer of my Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I quite admit all that the hon. gentleman has said regarding the merits of Mr. Perley; and I also admit that the hon. gentleman, in the matter he has referred to, is able to speak from experience. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that when people accept titles, they are not satisfied until they get something else.

19. Departmental contingencies ..... \$153,950.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Before the item passes, I wish to call the attention of the extraordinary amount of the sum which is spent every year on extra clerks. It has been said over and over again on the Opposition side of the House, that this expenditure would, under the new arrangement of the Civil Service, be done away with; but I notice, from the Public Accounts, that while the fixed charges for regular clerks in the various Departments are increasing, the expenditure for extra clerks, instead of being reduced, is being increased. Last year the expenditure for this service

Mr. BLAKE.

alone was as follows:—For the Privy Council, \$589; for the Department of Justice, \$267; for the Department of Militia, \$1,215; for the Secretary of State's Department, \$1,621; for the Department of the Interior, \$538; for the Indian Department, \$1,378; for the Auditor General's Department, \$1,003; for the Finance Department, \$1,580; for the Inland Revenue Department, \$2,555; for the Post Office Department, \$10,620; for the Department of Agriculture, \$2,346; and for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, \$3,445; in all, \$27,177. The Government can, perhaps, explain what necessity there is for this large extra service, while the service generally is involving a larger expenditure.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the hon. gentleman will compare the Estimates with last year's expenditure, under this head, he will find that we are asking for some \$20,000 less than was expended last year. This is largely the result of the transfer of eighteen or twenty packers in the Post Office Department to the regular list, which enables us to reduce the estimated contingencies about \$13,000. The expenditures last year, under the head of contingencies, was \$23,000 more than the Estimates, and the Estimates this year will be lower than the estimate on account of the increased number of temporary employes in the Department. Hon. members who have visited the Department of Interior, both last Session and this, will be aware that on account of the extended operations in connection with land sales, there must be a large number of persons employed who are not on the regular staff, but are paid a per day rate, and this is charged against contingencies. The amount asked for next year is \$23,000 less than was expended last year, and that has been brought about by the transference of men paid out of contingencies to the permanent staff.

Mr. ROSS. In view of that explanation, it might be supposed that there will be a reduction under the head of contingencies. Yet the hon. Finance Minister is asking \$13,950 more for contingencies next year than for the last year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The expenditure on contingencies will be at least \$15,000 less than was expended last year.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). We have reason, then, to hope that the expenditure for contingencies will be reduced.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It must be largely reduced.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I must congratulate the hon. Minister on the desirable change which has been made by placing temporary employes, whose services were absolutely required, on the regular staff, especially as in many cases they were employed, not so much because their services were absolutely necessary, as because some unfortunate individual wanted temporary employment. I desire to call attention to the large expenditure of the Heads of the various Departments. I do not know the reason for the increase, whether it was on account of the great commotion at the Capital and the hon. Ministers', finding it necessary to travel hither and thither through the Dominion; but I find that the expenditure for travelling expenses was, perhaps, greater than in any previous year. The head of the Privy Council charged \$256; the Minister of Justice, \$535; the Minister of Militia, \$921—I suppose that was in reviewing the troops and seeing that Her Majesty's active Militia were properly caparisoned and doing their work well—Secretary of State, \$1,140; the Minister of the Interior, \$3,005; Minister of Finance \$749; Minister of Customs, \$205; Minister of Inland Revenue, \$125; Minister of Public Works, \$1,677; Postmaster General, \$1,527; Minister of Agriculture, \$127; Minister of Marine,