

responsible adviser, who, it was to be assumed, were the men possessing the highest ability and statesmanship to be found in the country. He agreed there ought to be a disparity, but not that it should be so vast.

Hon. Mr. Langevin, in French, opposed the motion.

Hon. Mr. Holton said the Minister of Finance and the Secretary of State had both referred to words which were originally in the motion, but which had been struck out, and which were in no way before the House. He begged to give an explanation on this point. He had inserted a clause to make the reduction general by applying it to the salaries of Ministers. But on reflection, he had considered it better to strike it out lest his motion should appear to have a party aspect.

Hon. Mr. Connell made some remarks which were inaudible in the gallery. He was understood to comment on the Civil Service Bill, as showing the want of a disposition to retrench on the part of the Government, and to give his support to Mr. Holton's motion.

Mr. Bellerose, in French, declared himself an advocate of economy, but said he would vote against the amendment. He was not disposed to assist gentlemen opposite who were the opponents of Confederation to get possession of the treasury benches.

Sir John A. Macdonald said honourable members in voting against this motion would not thereby preclude themselves from voting on any future occasion, for any of the three propositions contained in it. It was an obstructive and factious motion. The member for Chateaugay could have brought it forward at any time since the beginning of the session, but he had postponed it till near the close of the session in order to bring it forward to stop the supplies. The way in which the Governor-General's salary was struck at, in connection with the pay of the most insignificant servants of the Government, was an insult to the representative of Her Majesty. The Government were quite prepared to discuss the question of the Governor-General's salary when brought up at the proper time, but they would not be dragged into a discussion of it when linked with the salaries of tidewaiters, doorkeepers, and messengers. If the honourable gentleman had wanted a fair discussion, he had ample opportunity of bringing forward each proposition separately long before this. The way in which he brought it forward prevented fair

discussion. As no amendment was allowable, honourable members who, like the member for Compton, thought the Governor's salary should be less than \$35,000, and others who thought it should be at some point between \$50,000 and \$35,000 were prevented from taking the sense of the House on their respective views. The honourable gentleman had not attempted to argue his second proposition to reduce all salaries by 12½ per cent. He had merely stated that the House had reduced the salaries of its own employees by that amount, and that the same rule should be applied to employees of the Government. That was no reason at all. He did not know if the honourable gentleman supported that reduction as regarded employees of the House.

Hon. Mr. Chauveau—He voted against it.

Sir John A. Macdonald—And yet he would apply that principle of which he disapproved to the salaries of all employees. That was the honourable gentleman's morality. A Committee of this House, after full investigation, had recommended the reduction. To make a parallel between the two cases there should have been a similar investigation into the salaries of Government employees and a similar recommendation. The motion was one of want of confidence in the Government; for in effect it stated that the Government could not be trusted to maintain due economy in the public service.

Mr. Blake said honourable gentlemen opposite, the Minister of Finance and the Secretary of State, had criticized not only what was contained in the motion, but what had been left out of it. This should be a lesson to honourable members to make fair copies of their motions. If there was one thing beyond another to which members had pledged themselves before their constituents, it was that they would endeavour to stop the wasteful extravagance which had hitherto characterized the administration of the Government. This session had nearly reached its close without anything in this direction having been done by Government, and the member for Chateaugay had therefore deemed it his duty to give the House, by this motion, an opportunity of giving expression to their views in this matter. The Minister of Justice said it was disrespectful to the Governor-General to couple his salary in this motion with those of other servants of the public. If there was anything in that view, His Excellency should have a separate blue book and separate estimate for himself, and a