

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. CASEY. Is the hon. member satisfied with the propriety of making a per diem allowance?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government will take care to limit the time as far as possible to save expense.

Mr. BLAKE. The possibility of travelling expenses ought not to be recognized in the case of persons named to assist the Board. Those persons should belong to the localities in which the examinations are held, and not require travelling expenses.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I move that the words "exclusive of travelling expenses" be struck out in the case of sub-examiners.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose these local assistants are merely to see that the examination is fairly conducted, that they have nothing to do with the sending of papers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The papers will be sent to the local examiners and they will come back.

On resolution 2,

Mr. BLAKE. I think this is objectionable. It is quite possible that the salaries of the Deputy-Heads ought not to be all at the same figure, but I cannot perceive any reason whatever for the proposed discretion which is to be given to the Governor in Council to determine what shall be the salary of a Deputy-Head. The Government knows, by this time, what are the duties and the responsibilities of the office of Deputy-Head of each Department. We ought to have a statement made of what the salaries are to be. I object, also, that there is no necessity for this discretion to the Governor in Council, because the Government knows to-day as well as it ever will know what the salaries ought to be. I object that it is contrary to sound principle to permit the Governor in Council to have this discretion without reason. I object, further, that so far as I can judge, it is intended to give a latitude to the Governor in Council subsequently to increase the salaries, and the salary of a Deputy-Head ought to be a fixed sum. I would ask the hon. Minister if it is intended that this salary shall be the sole emolument of all the Deputy-Heads. At present we have a system under which, in various forms, additional emoluments are paid to certain of the officers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman's objections are not well founded as to giving the Governor in Council power to fix these salaries. The hon. gentleman must see that by this Bill, the minimum and maximum salaries for these Deputy-Heads are fixed for this year. The Governor in Council will have no right to increase the salaries for this year, because we have no money voted to enable us to go beyond the maximum. But in the future, should the Governor in Council think that a salary is not sufficient, then they would have to ask Parliament for a vote of money to increase the salary; therefore the whole thing is in the hands of Parliament. The same rule will hold as to all other salaries. These provisions are not new, they are the provisions of the present law. Not a single dollar can be added to a salary without the previous sanction of Parliament. In answer to the hon. gentleman's question, I may say that no additional emolument of any kind will be given to these officers, whose maximum salaries shall not exceed \$4,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is to be done with those who are above \$4,000 now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a provision in the Bill by which the position of the present officers shall not be disturbed.

On resolution 5,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would move that the word "biennial" should be replaced by the word "annual."

Mr. CASEY. I think that is a step in the right direction, and that, indeed, the hon. Minister might go a little further. I think the annual increase in pay should be more rapid in the ranks of the service, because it is while a man is in the lower ranks that he is really improving.

Amendment agreed to.

On resolution 6,

Mr. CASEY. I think it is during the first two or three years of clerical service that a clerk improves in the knowledge of his duties. After that time no increase of salary should take place, unless he changes to more difficult work. I would prefer that such clerks should obtain an annual increase of \$100 for three or four years, and afterwards reduce it to a lower ratio, instead of the provision of \$50 a year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it better to make the increase \$50 a year, for this reason: Third-class clerks are generally young men whose wants are less than those who have a number of persons dependent upon them. The increase is given in order that such clerks may improve during several years, in order that they may show themselves worthy of promotion.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister, in pursuing this course, is practically giving up perhaps the most important recommendation of the Civil Service Commission. In the English service it has been the practice for a considerable time to give fair salaries to the higher grades of officers, and to have a purely clerical staff at low salaries, quite distinct from the ordinary Civil Service. The practical result of the hon. gentleman's policy will be to give such clerks about \$1,000 a year, while the service will be filled with a large number of third or fourth rate men who are of no use except for purely clerical work. It would be much better to abolish the third class and have them placed on a similar footing with temporary clerks.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I desire to call the attention of the Committee to the prevailing salaries. The average salary in the Governor General's Secretary's Office is \$2,000; Privy Council, \$1,070; Department of Justice, \$1,300 in one Branch, and in the Penitentiaries Branch, \$1,362; Militia and Defence, \$1,344; Secretary of State, \$1,090; Department of the Interior, \$1,200; North-West Mounted Police, \$1,200; Department of Indian Affairs, \$1,010; Auditor-General, \$1,150; Department of Finance and Treasury Board, \$1,300; Inland Revenue, \$1,250; Customs, \$1,200; Savings Banks and Post Offices, \$951; Agriculture, \$1,084; Marine and Fisheries, \$1,240; Public Works, \$1,400; Railways and Canals, \$1,580. Many of those salaries are paid for purely clerical work, such as copying letters and documents. Take the Department of Militia and Defence, where there is no clerical work done, the average salary is \$1,334, the lowest salaries being \$600 to \$800. It is evident the country is paying some officers more than they are worth, while probably some of the higher officers are not paid enough. The worst feature of the Bill is that it proposes to continue this system instead of adopting that which prevails in England. I discussed the matter with the Chairman of the British Committee once or twice, and I learnt from him the great saving which had taken place in England, and I regret the same has not been adopted here. I regret exceedingly that it has not been introduced here. It is perfectly clear that it can be introduced, and that it ought to be introduced, and that it would serve an excellent purpose and enable us to do full justice to those classes I have referred to as being absolutely necessary in every Department—those possessing the higher grade of duties and the higher average of intelligence to perform them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think that by this measure we will obtain as good a class of officers as we would have had under the previous system; but I think the