

be given by a provincial legislature, and not by the Dominion Parliament. Section 2 provides as follows :—

Process for the attachment of the said moneys shall be served upon the accountant of the department—

Where is the difficulty of serving such a notice on the accountant of the House of Commons, or the accountant of the Senate ?

—by which they are payable, or in the case of an attachment against moneys payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, upon the Auditor General.

If moneys are not payable to any department, or through the accountant of any department, then the process may be served upon the Auditor General. But section 3 appears to have an entirely different object in view. It applies solely to civil servants. The first section may or may not apply to civil servants ; but if it does apply to civil servants, it also applies to members of Parliament and to contractors, or to any one receiving money from the Crown ; but section 3 applies only to civil servants, and it applies to the salaries coming due. The previous clause appears to apply to money in the hands of the Crown already earned ; the last clause applies to money to be earned, under a contract of employment, a civil servant hiring for a year, or a contractor earning money under contract with the Crown. The Bill is very crudely drawn and appears to go very much further than the hon. gentleman who introduced it intended. I agree with the opinion expressed by the hon. Solicitor General, that it would be much better to consider this Bill very carefully before the House endeavours to crystallize a crude Bill of this nature into law, and find afterwards that it conflicts with the law at present in force. I am entirely in sympathy with the aim of the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill. I never could see any reason why civil servants should be in the position of wards of the Government, like Indians, and why they should not occupy a similar position to other persons in the community. A civil servant should stand in the same relationship, with respect to his debts and the collection of those debts, as any other member of the community. I do not see why he should be exempted any more than any one else. It should be an inducement to him, so far as possible, to keep himself out of the toils of the law, and he should endeavour to stand with as high credit as possible under the circumstances.

Mr. CAMERON. I have a word or two to say on this subject. The hon. members for Laval and Kingston have expressed some doubts as to the power of this Parliament to pass the legislation proposed. Great lawyers and great men have always doubts. Thank goodness, I never have any doubts, and I do not admit, in the least, that the

Parliament of Canada has not the power to pass this Bill, if it sees fit to pass it, in its present shape. Whether the Bill is a good one or a poor one, is another question. I cannot see any reason, either, why we should limit the operation of this Bill to poor civil servants. I think every man receiving allowances from the Crown should come under the provisions of this Bill or some other Bill. What reason is there why members of Parliament should escape payment of honest debts, while we make poor civil servants, on perhaps \$600 a year, pay their debts ? Why should the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and distinguished members of the Cabinet, not be compelled to pay their honest debts ? My own idea on the subject is, that if the Bill should pass, it should apply to every class—judges, legislators, Senators, Ministers of the Crown and lieutenant-governors. Why, I know of a lieutenant-governor who could not get a pair of shoes on credit. I know a judge who was up before another judge half a dozen times, and escaped on the ground that it was of importance that the position should be sustained, when he could not pay a grocery bill. I know an inspector of inland revenue who had judgments galore against him, and, on the attempt being made to garnishee, appeared before a judge of the county under our Ontario procedure, for examination, and escaped upon the ground that these salaries were assigned by the Government to the civil servants to maintain the dignity of the position, when that man could not pay his grocer's bill—or if he could, he never did. He drew a salary of \$1,600 and lived like a nabob, and yet escaped the payment of his little debts. My own opinion is that the Bill should go to the extreme limit. When I say that, I do not mean to say that it would apply to one-tenth of the civil servants. I do not believe it would. I believe the great mass of the civil servants pay their honest debts, but unfortunately we know that there are civil servants who will not pay their debts if they can escape, and under the law as it is they can escape. You may sue them, you may get judgment against them, but what is the use of a judgment against a civil servant who has nothing in the world to depend upon but the salary he gets from the Government. And so they escape the payment of their debts for the absolute necessities of life ; their grocer's bill remains unpaid, their shoemaker's bill remains unpaid, their baker's and their butcher's bill all remain unpaid. I know of such men within my own knowledge, and I say it is a scandal to the law of the land. Perhaps I should say it is not creditable to the Administration when they allow civil servants to remain in office who will not pay their honest debts. Now, Sir, we have the power here ; if we have not the power