

separate day on which his salary should be voted. Ministers, when charged with not having carried out retrenchment, fell back on their Civil Service Act, which was now awaiting its 2nd reading. This however did not meet the case, for the Bill distinctly provided that it should not affect the salary of any clerk or officer now in the employment of Government. To this day the Government had not by anything they had done or proposed to do, got rid of the necessity for decisive action by this House in the direction of retrenching the expenses of the public service. Some honourable gentlemen were to vote against the motion because it did not go far enough—because they thought the Governor's salary should be reduced to \$30,000. If this motion were carried, it would not prevent action hereafter to reduce the salary below \$35,000. It would merely place it at that point for the present session. He did not hope for any practical action from those gentlemen to reduce it to \$30,000, and the effect of the course they were taking would just be to keep the salary at \$50,000. The country would understand the value of the pretensions of those gentlemen to economy when they were found voting against this motion. Action was what this country wanted, not profession, and thus with reference to the salaries of Government officials generally, which were admitted to be too high. If there was to be any retrenchment it must be by practical action like this, and not by leaving it to general professions on the part of the Government to economise.

Hon. J. H. Cameron said he opposed the motion on grounds different from those hitherto advanced. He thought the Governor-General's salary not too high. He thought the salaries of Government officials should not be reduced by 12½ per cent, and he thought if they did extra work they should get extra pay. He opposed the motion on these grounds, and would not be afraid to justify his course before his constituents. While his election was going on, the question of Governor's salary was repeatedly brought up, and he had always declared that he was prepared to vote for keeping it as it is. It was the only contribution we made to the empire, and its amount should be commensurate with the dignity of the officer as representative of Her Majesty, to whom it was voted. We could not expect that description of statesmen to be sent us as Governor who would most worthily represent the Crown, if the honour of the position was all that was offered. As for the

[Mr. Blake (Durham West).]

reduction of 12½ per cent on the salaries of Government officers, it would be misery to them, and a small saving in the aggregate to the public treasury.

Hon. Mr. Chauveau spoke in opposition to Mr. Holton's motion.

Mr. E. M. McDonald said that it was a most extraordinary un-British theory the Government had propounded. Were they to be told that the House had no right to decide on the items submitted? If so, what was the House for? Was the whole power to be left in the hands of the thirteen gentlemen holding themselves above the control of Parliament? If so, then the sooner Parliament delegated its functions to those 13 men the better. Were members to have the Ministerial rod held over them, as had been done yesterday and to-day, so that it was to be threatened that if they voted against the Government here they voted against British connection. When it comes to be the case that the Government are obliged to hold the whip over the heads of their own supporters, as had been seen, it was a bad sign of how affairs were. As for Government employees, they had higher pay than they could obtain as teachers or merchants' clerks, who had just as responsible and as onerous functions to perform. He knew that there were Government employees who could give two-thirds of their time to other business, and get paid for it. This was wrong. Those who received good full years' salaries from the Government, owed the Government their whole time, and should give it. If, on this question of salaries, the House here was to be whipped into line by a ministerial whip, it was time the people knew how so unwarrantable a departure from British precedent was defended. This was a British Legislature he was proud to say, and he wanted to see British precedents of legislation and good government obtain. The five or six millions asked for for fortifications were urged by the Government to be voted without any regard to the public opinion of the country.

Mr. Bolton said he was in favour of retrenchment, but he could not vote for cutting down all salaries indiscriminately. In his own Province the public officers did not receive salaries equal to those in this part of the Dominion. But he could not vote for reducing them.

Mr. Little said the vote he was called up to give this evening caused him a good deal of embarrassment. There was no man in this