

pointments in the civil service, and in listening to pleadings for increases of salary or allowance. I hope this Bill will put a stop to all that sort of thing, and that we shall turn over a new leaf. So far as the use of these words 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' is concerned, the old government and the new can touch thumbs; the one is about as guilty as the other. The expression may be more generally used now than it was under the former government, but it is time we put a stop to it, now and forever.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to move an amendment in that sense?

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—I shall consider my hon. friend's suggestion.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—In the light of the hon. gentleman's former speeches, I expected that he would.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Halifax)—In connection with the observations by the hon. gentleman from Wellington, I may say that what he calls a disease in the Civil Service is not confined to them; it belongs to the human race. There is not a senator here that has not some little part of that disease. We are all trying to make more money, and we should not blame the civil servants or speak harshly of them, because they are not greater sinners in that respect than we are all ourselves.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It is a great compliment to the late government that the hon. Secretary of State could not furnish further evidence of what he calls their dereliction of duty.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I did not call it dereliction of duty.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—In every case where they were asked to use that expression 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary,' it was for a special purpose and parliament knew why it was used. But there is nothing of the kind in the estimates before us. There is no precedent, under the Conservative administration for such an item as we find here, asking \$1,500,000 for one department, and simply saying

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN.

it is to be expended on the Civil Service as the minister or the government may think proper. It is all very well for the hon. gentlemen to say that while a large sum is taken, only a small portion of it may be spent. If the former government sinned, they erred to a very limited extent as compared with the sins of the present government.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—The hon. leader of the House says that the intention of this clause is, to a certain extent, to protect the government against a violation of the Civil Service Act. Suppose we read from line 20 of the clause in this way: 'Or to any other person permanently employed in the public service except by Act of Parliament,' and stop there. There ought to be some finality in these salaries. There should not be estimates every year with a sort of caveat 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' It is really a confession that we are doing something that is exceptional, presumably sheltering ourselves under the Supply Bill. I never thought that the Supply Bill was in that sense an Act of Parliament. I am not sure if the Auditor General construed the Act of Parliament authorizing himself to hold his position that he would honour a payment of that kind.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—If he would do that in the form in which it has been done, he would not be debarred from doing it certainly if the provision was that there should be no increase of salaries except by Act of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—Would not putting it in the Supply Bill be an Act of Parliament?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—The hon. senator from Hastings says he thinks it would be sufficient authority. I stand corrected from his superior experience, but I am quite sure that the government would not bring down a Bill to parliament providing for an increase of salaries to the same extent exceptional increases are done under the Supply Bill. We had a Bill before us in regard to the Auditor General, and another in regard to the superintendent