

average will not increase so fast as under the existing system, because now we have four classes instead of three, while the time a man may remain in a class is five years, by this measure the time fixed for the third class would be twelve years. Of course, an officer may be promoted from one class to another if there is a vacancy, and he is fit for it, and he has passed his examination. The increase from \$400 to \$1,000 will be slow; as it is by steps of \$50 a year, it will take twelve years to reach that maximum, so that if a young man enters the service at eighteen he will be thirty before he gets \$1,000, and if he enters at twenty-two he will be thirty-four. I think \$1,000 would not be an excessive salary for a man at that age, after spending that time in the public service.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman misapprehends our point. We say that it would be much better not to have any third class at all. If he likes he could admit a man into the second class, reducing the minimum salary and allowing them to work their way up. I am sure that that would add materially to the efficiency of the service within a few years. We do not want to bring into the service a class of men, respectable enough, but of very mediocre ability, who would regard \$1,000 as a very handsome salary. We want to secure men for the highest class of whom something can be made, and we would better the service considerably if we adopted the scale of salaries that the hon. gentleman proposes, because it would not allow him to give fair salaries to those who deserved them.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the hon. gentleman's argument is sound with reference to those classes of officers who attain the maximum efficiency in two or three years, and who cannot rise any higher except by fitting themselves for what you may call the more intellectual classes of the service. I think the Commission demonstrated the fact that a large proportion of the whole work is of a routine, clerical, mechanical character, and they suggest that every man who is simply a good writer, and nothing more, ought to have eight or ten years in which to reach a salary of \$1,000. It is not our experience of that class of persons that they earn any more, and why should they in the Civil Service? I should be sorry to say that writers should not have the opportunity of promotion in common with others in their ranks; but I think it is a mistake to perpetuate an error by which, as the Commissioners all agree, there is a culmination in the higher classes of the highest salaries irrespective of the work performed by the great bulk of the service.

Mr. CASEY. I agree very strongly with the remarks of the hon. members who have just spoken. I think, if there is an increment at all it should be the most rapid in the lower grades. It is important too that there should be an opportunity afforded for the promotion of those who display a special aptitude for certain of the higher classes of work, as recommended by the Commissioners; a system which gives regular annual increases of salary to officers so long as they do not misconduct themselves is utterly ruinous to the system, and unfair to those who display special ability in the performance of their work. The Civil Service should be regarded as any other profession in which the highest salaries should go to those who display the highest merit. This may be done by employing a considerable number of non-promotable, temporary writers, such as are employed in England, and reserving the prizes of the service for those who display ability in the discharge of their duties. I notice from the returns that a number of clerks who were appointed several years ago, between 1873 and 1875, have not yet been promoted from the third class, and have not yet received any of the annual increase of \$50. I would like to know whether they will be placed as receiving the salary they ought to have received, and whether the arrears of increases will be paid to them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not able to answer that, but the policy of the Government is to preserve to the officers in the service the rights they have now. Besides, there will be some weeks before the law can be put into force, and during that time the Government may see what the rights of those officers are.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to observe, with reference to the marine mail clerk, that I do not see what there is in our situation to render it important that we should preserve a class of officers which is not preserved by any other country. Mails for Europe are leaving New York every day, and I believe none of them are accompanied by mail clerks. What reason can there be for our retaining permanently, for that fraction of the mails which goes by the Canadian lines, these marine clerks, when we know that the great bulk of the correspondence is carried by other lines without them?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman will allow the resolution to go, when we come to the third reading of the Bill, I shall be able to obtain from the Post Office Department the reason why this is done.

Mr. BLAKE. I have received, as I suppose every other hon. member has, a statement with reference to the railway mail clerks. May I ask whether the hon. gentleman has considered their position, or whether the original plan remains unaltered by the proposal now made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I myself received a statement from some of these officers, who are very deserving, but the Post Office Department, which I consulted, are of opinion that third-class clerks should remain. The proposal of the railway mail clerks, so far as I recollect, was that there should be only two classes, so that the salaries would be higher at the beginning, and they might advance sooner than at present. The Post Office Department, however, is of opinion that the present salaries are sufficient, because there are certain additions given for extra work such as night work.

Resolutions agreed to and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 35) respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 44,

Mr. CASEY. I think the power to grant leave of absence for twelve months, for any other reason except sickness, is not well founded.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am of a different opinion.

Mr. CASEY. What other reason can you give?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. An officer may have a very important case in England, France or Germany, and will require leave of absence. Of course, the Governor in Council will have to provide for a successor to be paid out of the salary of that officer.

On clause 45,

Mr. CASEY. In regard to this power of suspension, I am not in favor of putting too much power in the hands of the Deputy-Head, though the initiative should be taken by him, as he is more directly in contact with the clerks and knows best their conduct and deserts. I think this power should be primarily in the hands of the Deputy-Heads rather than with the responsible or political Heads who will know little about the clerks. This change would remove a great deal of trouble from the hon. Minister's shoulders, and relieve him of the suspicion of suspending any one through personal or political motives. The hon. Minister need not