

differentiated in regard to their duties, one man holding an exceedingly responsible position and another man holding a less responsible position, who perhaps has been longer in the service and yet is not considered capable of holding the higher position, that the man holding the responsible position should be more highly paid than the other. I do not consider that this distinction has been sufficiently drawn in the Department of Interior—I do not know how it is in regard to the other departments—I think there has been too much disposition to give consideration to the length of service rather than to ability and satisfactory work. I consider Mr. Henry is a very efficient officer, and therefore I ask the House to increase his salary by \$100.

Mr. FOSTER. Were both those men on the permanent temporary list?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. They were on the permanent list?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. From information I have, Mr. Henry has been on the permanent list for twenty-six years.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason that no salaries appeared opposite their names in the estimates for 1896-97?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were estimated for as so many first or second-class clerks; and as regards the special vote asked for, of course no corresponding vote was asked last year.

Mr. FOSTER. As regards the four technical officers, are they the same as before, and are their salaries the same?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are the same officers—there has been no change.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of item No. 10?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The salary asked for Mr. Keyes is \$1,500, his previous salary having been \$1,400. He is the chief clerk of the branch of the department which looks after the disposing of ordnance lands and the collection of revenue derived from those lands. He was appointed on July 17, 1878, at a salary of \$700, and has therefore been nineteen years in the service. He is now chief clerk of the branch, and my reason for asking the House to increase his salary by \$100 is almost similar to the reason given in the case of Mr. Henry. Mr. Keyes being in charge of an important branch, I thought it well to recommend this slight increase in recognition of his efficiency. Of course, I take it that the House understands that when I ask the salary of an officer to be increased, it is done because I have made an examination of his work, and have found the officer efficient.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman that he is taking most extraordinary power, as head of the department, in violating the provisions of the Civil Service Act. I know very well that this is not the first time men have been advanced, notwithstanding the provisions of that Act; but the hon. gentleman has gone a long way beyond anything done by his predecessors in that direction. Not only has he recommended that a new status be given to Mr. Rothwell, but he has recommended an increase of salary in the present case, and all this is in the teeth of the Civil Service Act. I submit that this is a very dangerous position for the head of the department to take, because it leaves in his own hands a wider discretion than I think was ever contemplated by that Act. So while I do not object to what the hon. gentleman says, when he declares that the efficiency and work of the officials determined him to take this extraordinary course. I wish to point out to him and his colleagues that they are accumulating a good deal of trouble for themselves, because the exercise of this discrimination between the merits of members of the service will prove a matter of considerable worry to them hereafter. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman that there should be some officials in the Department of Interior possessing, if not a complete knowledge of law in the sense of being a lawyer, at least possessing that status, because the issuing of letters-patent requires the application of a legal mind, if not a legal knowledge. The same may be said in regard to other departments, but that is a rule not observed by the present Government in regard to some of the other departments.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to point out that here we have, as an initial step, the cost of the department increased by \$1,900.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, look at the next page.

Mr. DAVIN. I observe it has been increased on the whole by \$400; but in regard to items up to No. 10, the increase has been \$1,900. I do not rise to object very strongly to this increase, but I wish to point out that this is the beginning of a policy of economy.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the superannuation allowance of Mr. H. H. Smith?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. \$1,590 a year.

Mr. HUGHES. Were the ordinary ten years added to his time?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Was any addition given to his time of service?