

the plan proposed, that object will be attained, together with economy. It has been stated that you can fill your second-class clerkships from those who are remaining in the old third class, as it was before the law was amended. That is true, and as a rule, I fancy that is what would be done. But if vacancies occur in the second class through death or resignation, or the necessity for extra help, and you promote a third-class clerk to the vacant position, you create a vacancy in the third class.

**Mr. FOSTER.** That is the intention of the enactment.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** Quite so. As the law stands, one of the temporary employees, whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) calls writers, cannot be put into that class, for if he is put in as a temporary clerk to do the work, he still gets only \$600 and with no chance of advancement. Why should there not be an intermediate grade, to which one of your temporary writers, who has obtained the maximum of \$600, may pass, and so be given an opportunity to work his way up? The ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), and other hon. gentlemen opposite, have found fault with the government, because they have withheld the statutory increases, which, they say, should mechanically raise the salaries of the civil servants by \$50 per annum; and yet these same hon. gentlemen object to this opportunity for advancement and increase of salary on the part of officers in the civil service. It does seem to me that it is more unjust to promote a man to a place made vacant by the death of one who was receiving \$1,000, and still pay him only \$600, with no chance of an increase. Let me illustrate the point by a case in my own department. Two years ago, a first-class clerk in the employ of the Customs Department, died. He was engaged in the work in which the ex-Finance Minister has referred—largely clerical work. He had gone on year after year, getting his advance, until, at the time of his death, he was in receipt of \$1,700 or \$1,750. His death took place after the estimate for his salary had been voted in the Committee of the Whole. But before the estimates were finally passed, I moved to reduce them by \$1,750, and, in the supplementary estimates, I placed a vote for \$1,750, with the words, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary.' My idea in doing that was this: I found I could get what I considered two capable men, one of whom would take the place of the man who had died, while the other would be of use, as the department was short-handed. And so I got the two men, paying no more than had been paid before. But this was done under special legislation, and every year—this year—I have to come to parliament and propose these votes 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary.' Hon.

**Mr. PATERSON.**

gentlemen opposite will see that if we had a class of the kind proposed, there would not be the necessity for this special legislation, but that when a salary lapsed through the death of the man to whom it was paid, the government should be free to put in a man at a much lower salary, and with the prospect of promotion. The ex-Finance Minister would tell me, I suppose, that when a first-class clerk dies, I should fill his place with a man from the second class, and fill his place with a man from the third class. But the vacant place in the third class could only be filled by giving the work to one of the writers who had obtained the maximum of \$600, but who could not be promoted stage by stage with the others, though doing his full share of the work with men in receipt of from \$700 to \$1,000. Though I have no doubt that the law now in force was adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite with the best intention, I must say it struck me from the moment I got a grasp of the working of the department, that there was this difficulty in the case. The third class no longer exists under the law, but this will have the effect of bringing back that class.

**Mr. CLANCY.** There is no necessity that we should keep the third class as full as it is now. The object was that this class should finally pass out altogether.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** That means that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is in favour of those who are to-day doing the higher class of work, being paid \$1,100 from the start. While it is true that there is a class of work which faithful men can perform, and are ready to perform at comparatively low salaries, there is a certain class of duties that we cannot find men to perform, paying them only a maximum of \$600 a year. I say again, in conclusion, that the broad fact struck me that for the government to be shut up, either to give a person \$1,100 or be content to fill any vacancy that may occur, with persons who are willing to give their services for \$400, is a position that we should not be confined to. It does not work in the interest of the public service, and I believe the creation of this class will result in economy.

**Mr. McNEILL.** At the present time, I understand, there is no possibility of promoting a deserving man from the writer class.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** Except to the second class, which is \$1,100.

**Mr. McNEILL.** He can be promoted now to that class?

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** Yes, to \$1,100.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** But I thought my hon. friend was arguing that he could not do that.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** No, I was arguing that it was not desirable to be