

are now doing work at \$600 and give them rank and promotion, that would be a fair subject for criticism. In that case we would have to come before the House and explain what we were doing.

Mr. CARGILL. At present the third-class clerks are doing work at a maximum salary of \$600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman means the temporary writers.

Mr. CARGILL. Now, the mere technical work commands a salary of from \$1,100 up. I understand that the object of this Bill is to enable the government to pay the men who are at present receiving a maximum salary of \$600, to pay them \$800 for doing the same kind of work that they are doing at present for \$600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, that is hardly a correct statement of the case. It does not necessarily follow that one single man of the temporary service must be appointed to these grades at all, but they may be. This temporary class is still to be continued for what might be called the ordinary office work, such as copying, &c., you will still have the writer class for this work. But if there is in any class a bright young man who has been a temporary clerk and who is capable of better work and we wish to select him for promotion, we can do so. But I do not anticipate that any such general use of the Bill will be made in that way.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not see why the civil servants of this country should not be treated on business principles in the same manner as a business man treats his own clerks. If I were to engage a man and tell him that I would start him at \$400, and that for all time to come he need not expect to get any more than \$400 or \$600, I would find great difficulty in getting men. I do not think the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Cargill) treats his own men in that way. He says that he has never been fortunate enough to get any individual appointed in the service. I may tell him frankly that he is a very lucky man, because the moment he got one of his friends appointed he would be immediately beset by that person and by his friends to procure for him a raise of salary. This Bill is a step in the right direction, because it gives the government power to increase the salaries of men who are really deserving of an increase, owing to the nature of the work that they are performing. Because a man has been in a certain class eight or ten years, it does not necessarily follow that he is more able to do the work after all that period than he was when he entered. But there may be a man who has been in that class for ten years, and who performs his duties more efficiently than when he entered the service at \$400, and for all time to come must that man remain at the salary at which he en-

Mr. FIELDING.

tered the service, that is, if he merits an increase, unless he has a political pull by which he can rise to \$600? I think this Bill commends itself to every member of the House. When men in the service know that they have an opportunity of promotion by reason of faithful service, they are going to do better work. The promotion is not to be by leaps and bounds. As has been pointed out by the Postmaster General, he has 58 men in his employ, and he cannot pay one of them more than \$600, he cannot advance any one of those men into another class unless he gives him \$500 of an increase at one step. We must admit that \$500 is a very large increase to give any man unless it is given for very special service. I say that the government is wise in taking this power without having to come down to parliament and appeal specially for any man in the service. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) advanced the idea that the government was going to be defeated and they wanted to put their friends into the permanent service before the Conservative government came into power. Now, we can understand exactly what his idea of politics is. His idea is that the knife is going to be brought into play by the Conservatives the moment they get into power. What was all this squealing about the first session of this parliament when the Conservatives were imploring the Liberals not to remove some Conservatives from office? In 1878, after the Mackenzie government was defeated, there was not a man in the service that had been appointed by that government, who was not dismissed within 24 hours after the Conservative government took office unless he was tied down by order in council. So it appears that the same thing is going to be repeated when the Conservatives get into power. Let me tell my hon. friend that he will not be in the House when the Conservative party gets into power. I say the government ought to be supported in this measure, by which they take power to promote efficient men in the service and not be obliged, as the member for Hacklmand (Mr. Montague) says, to retain men in the service at large salaries who are not worth \$300 a year. I say that the minister would be derelict in his duty if he had not brought in a Bill to relieve the government from the necessity of paying men more than they are worth.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When I was a member of the government I began the cleaning out process from the moment I started, and I was attacked very bitterly for it. It appears to me that the courtly gentleman from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) made his statement under a little excitement. I see in the press to-day something which throws a little light upon the question of government patronage. I see by the *Toronto Mail* that a delegation of French Canadian Liberals