

tion; I deny its power to enforce an attaching order or to go a step beyond an attaching order. Then, Sir, tell me what is the sense of discussing this Bill? The law officers of the Crown ought at once tell us that a proceeding of this kind is wholly valueless.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The Solicitor General pointed out that.

**Mr. CAMERON.** The suggestion which I propose to make will, I think, cover the whole case, but the Bill does not go far enough.

It attacks only the salaries of officials, and, it is said by the Solicitor General, moneys due by the Crown to contractors. If it goes that far, for my own part, I would be opposed to that portion of the Bill. One can easily understand the complications and difficulties that might arise in case a creditor stepped in and took a garnishee proceeding for moneys due a contractor. But as to the civil servants and the judges and the members of the Government, and all officials, I do not know any reason why a creditor should not be able to proceed against them in a cheap and simple way. You cannot do it by Act of Parliament, but you can do it in some other way. Let me suggest to the gentlemen on the Treasury benches a way in which it could be done and ought to have been done long ago. Let them adopt the American system. The Government at Washington have adopted a system which costs nothing. You do not require a garnishee order, or an order of sequestration, or an injunction, or anything of the kind. You can do it with the stroke of a pen, and do it at once. I am not as a rule in favour of taking lessons from the Yankees; but it is well sometimes, when they lay down a good rule, to act on it. The Secretary of the Treasury at Washington issued a circular to the employees to the effect that all clerks receiving a stated salary who neglected to pay their debts, without presenting satisfactory reasons therefor, should not be retained in the service. Let this Government pass an Order in Council or resolution that, if it can be shown, for instance, by the production of a certificate of the clerk of a township or a town, that A. B. is three months in arrear in his taxes, or a certificate from the clerk of a court, under his signature and seal, that a judgment has been obtained against C. D., a civil servant, and that that debt or judgment has remained unsatisfied for three months, that man's office shall thereupon become vacant.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Would you apply that to members of Parliament?

**Mr. CAMERON.** Yes, I would. At least, I would not apply it so much to members as I would to the gentlemen on the Treasury benches. If you take that course, mark my

words, you will not be troubled very long with civil servants being in arrear. There will be very few to run the risk of having unsatisfied judgments recorded against them. When you let the civil servants understand their position, there will be very few of them who will not pay their debts in full; and I say to the Government, and to any government, that it is not creditable, it is not maintaining the dignity of the civil service, to leave it possible for them to be brought before a judge of a county court and examined touching their estate, for the non-payment of their butcher's bill, or their tailor's bill or their shoemaker's bill, and retain their positions. I know that the late Government had a great many faults—they were nearly all faults; but that was a fault which in some cases they did not commit. I know of two civil servants who were removed some years ago by a Minister of the Crown because they did not pay their debts. One of these was in arrear for his tailor's bill, for the very clothes he wore, and the Minister thought that if he could buy clothes, the least he could do was to pay for them out of his salary, and his services were dispensed with. That was the proper course to take, and I hope this Government will put it on a substantial and unchangeable ground, and will pass an order notifying all civil servants in the sense I have indicated; and if they do, I say again, the Government will have no trouble and no expense, the civil servant will have all the protection to which he is entitled, and the creditor will be enabled to obtain what is due to him.

**Mr. FOSTER.** How will the hon. gentleman apply that to cabinet ministers?

**Mr. CAMERON.** I am afraid we will have to pass a special statute respecting cabinet ministers and ex-cabinet ministers.

**Mr. McHUGH.** Mr. Speaker, I am in sympathy with the object of the Bill now before the House, and I would like to see it passed into law, even in some amended form. I am in sympathy with it because I think it is going to be beneficial both to the creditors of the civil service and to the civil service themselves. When the civil servants find that they are placed on the same basis as clerks in other institutions, they will practice economy to the extent that will enable them to pay their just debts. I do not think that the whole of the salary of the civil servant should be attached. The law of Ontario leaves \$25 to the labouring man or any other one whose salary is attached, although I understand that in some of the other provinces all the salary is attachable. But if the House passes this Bill, I think it would be right to leave some portion of the salary of civil servants unattachable to be applied to the immediate wants of their families. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says that the Bill is far-reaching in its scope. Well, we might take the wording of the Ontario Act which was