

vance him from one class to another, and then you put him at the maximum of a new class instead of allowing him to work his way up. He gets very nearly what Mr. Hall got after having been a long time secretary of the department. The fact is that the minister (Mr. Sifton) helps his favourites to large increases of salary. They do his bidding, and there are men in that same department who work just as faithfully and just as well, and they cannot get even the \$50 they ought to get as their statutory allowance. But the minister has favourites, and the minister has to pick and cull and choose, and he does so from his favourites in that department. He is doing it now, and he has done it from the time he came there. He commenced by penetrating a gross injustice on some of the best officers in his department, and then he picks out his favourites and advances them at the rate of \$600 or \$800 a year. Every one knows that this is eating all life and ambition out of the civil service and out of the department. The minister has not shown that Mr. Keyes is a man of such great ability that he must be put up by a leap of \$850.

The PRIME MINISTER. Some one must be secretary of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. And some one could be secured at \$1,800.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I do not think that will do. There is a salary attached to the importance of the position, and the salary ought to be more than that. Mr. Keyes apparently is a good officer, and he has been promoted to that position, and a salary is given to him, which he ought to have.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the acting Minister, when Mr. Hall was made secretary of the department?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In 1883. I think.

Mr. CLANCY. Did he receive \$2,400 then?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not in a position to answer that.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman could show that Mr. Hall commenced the secretaryship of the department at \$2,400, then the right hon. Prime Minister would probably have something of a case; but if Mr. Hall discharged the duties of the office at a lower salary, then there is no salary in particular attached to the secretaryship.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend must see that that would be no fair comparison at all. In the last three or four years the business of the department has more than doubled; and it is not fair to say that the salary paid twenty years ago to an officer occupying the same position, would be a fair salary to-day, when the duties are ten times as great. There is no foundation for

the statement that the minister has been picking out favourites.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I see that Mr. Roy, the secretary of the Public Works Department, only gets \$2,100.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If any one can dispute my statement that the duties and responsibilities of this man are heavy, and that is the reason we ask for a fair remuneration for him, that would be a fair matter for discussion. But my hon. friend will go through with the whole list, and he will find that in no case has any question of politics or favouritism entered.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose other secretaries have a good deal of work, too. Here is a secretary in the Department of Public Works see what an immense amount of business is rolled in on him, with the minister away, and he only gets \$2,100.

Mr. TALBOT. He is fresh, just coming in.

Mr. FOSTER. The one that went out was not fresh, and he only got \$2,100. Then, there is a secretary in the Department of Railways and Canals, who has been a secretary since 1896, and he only gets \$2,200. So that you cannot say that the secretary of the Department of the Interior is overwhelmed with business, and that other secretaries are not. The fact is that most of these secretaries came in as about first-class clerks, and worked themselves up by the increases; but this man is put at the head of the list at the start. Who is the secretary of the Finance Department?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Treadwell.

Mr. FOSTER. He only gets \$2,100. I am satisfied the Minister of Finance will not allow any invidious comparison to be made between him and Mr. Keyes, and Mr. Treadwell is an old officer. I venture to say that he does just as much work as Mr. Keyes, and does it just as well.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is a good officer.

Mr. FOSTER. But he must be satisfied with \$2,100, because he is under a minister who has some conscience in these matters, or is restrained by his deputy, I do not know which, while the other has no conscience and is out of the arena. No deserving man who is at work in the departments, doing an equal kind of work and getting less salary, but will feel aggrieved when he sees you putting a man at a jump above the rest of his class, when you first put him in office.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What must they have felt like when my hon. friend paid his predecessor \$2,800, while we are only asking \$2,400?