

The **PRIME MINISTER**. At what age are men paid that amount ?

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. A clerk goes in at 16. He gets a certain amount of increase every year. He does not get in permanently.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, it is a permanent institution.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Yes, but let him not do his work—

Mr. **GIBSON**. It is the same here.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. No, that is just the difference between the Bill we introduced, and the Bill hon. gentlemen opposite have introduced. We would employ these people as temporary writers. We proposed to test them as to their energy, ability and industry. And if we found them up to the mark in this respect, we made them permanent clerks. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) proposes, under this Bill, to make them permanent clerks at once, and that is the reason I am making these objections today.

Mr. **CAMPBELL**. I think the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) are very unfair to the civil servants. He said there were men in the departments who were getting \$1,000 who were not doing \$300 worth of work. Now, I do not believe that there are any such men in the departments, and if he knows of any such men, he ought to be man enough to name them, and not cast a slur upon the whole civil service of this Dominion.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). I desire to point out, from the standpoint of my own department, the necessity of this clause. There are in the inside service of the Post Office Department, at the present time, fifty-eight temporary employees whose maximum salary cannot exceed \$600. There are also a number of clerks in the inside service, some sixty of whom are receiving less than \$1,000, while many of them are at the maximum. I should like to have the temporary writers feel that there was some prize open to them that was reasonably within their reach, that there would be a fair opportunity for them to be drawn upon for promotion into the junior second class, whereas, the long step to the second class, with \$1,100 as a minimum, must be almost impossible. I am satisfied, therefore, so far as the Post Office Department is concerned, that the adoption of this clause will be a great advantage to the service. In order to leave no doubt as to the efficiency of the staff, I would say that, after careful attention to the staff of the Post Office Department, I am not aware of any one who is drawing \$1,000 who is not entitled to his money. We have an excellent staff; and, whatever views might be held by those who have no practical acquaintance with the

work of the staff, I can say that, while there are degrees of merit, while some may have been promoted a little beyond what they were entitled to, and some may not be in receipt of as much as they are entitled to for their services, yet there are many in the lower grades who might, with great advantage, be drafted into the higher positions of the service to the improvement of the service—if the system is not abused, as I do not think it will be. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) suggested that this was practically a restoration of the third class. Not so. It is very much easier to go on by annual increments of \$30 or \$40 a year from \$400 to \$1,000 than to go from \$400 to \$1,000 when there are two distinct classes. Therefore, in the division of what was formerly the third class into temporary writers and junior second class—if you choose to consider these two together as making a third class—I think the provision of the Bill makes a wholesome check against an unwise increase of salary, and, at the same time, offers a fair incentive to those in the lower class to look forward to promotion on their merits. I make these remarks because the hon. member for York appeared, in the earlier part of his argument, to intimate that in establishing this class it was designed to pass over all who were in the service that it was a way of bringing in outside people; and so, he proceeds to go through the list of third-class clerks, and asks why this one or that one has not been promoted to the second class, suggesting that it is intended to pass them over. I do not so regard it. He argued from an entirely false premise in suggesting that that was the scope of the Bill. Those in the lower grades will be as likely to receive promotion as before, and scope is offered for the meritorious in the lowest grade to rise.

Mr. **CARGILL**. Is not the object of this proposal to enable the departments to give from \$700 to \$1,000 for work that they are now getting done for \$600 ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No. At the utmost, the highest salary at which, under the Bill, one can commence will be \$800. The object of the Bill is to provide that if an additional officer is to be appointed, you can get him for from \$600 to \$800 instead of being obliged, as without the Bill, to pay \$1,100.

Mr. **CARGILL**. I understand the intention of the minister is to select a few men and give them an increase of \$800, and then let them work on up to a higher salary.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I believe this Bill will not add one to the list of persons employed in the civil service. But we cannot do what my hon. friend says without coming down to parliament and taking special votes for them. But if we attempted to take any large number of persons who