

tion. He also discountenanced the proposal to require from candidates for office oaths preventing them from asking or receiving any other emolument in addition to their salary from the Government. This, in his estimation, was going too far.

Mr. MEREDITH asked if it was the intention that sec. 10 should not affect clerks until 1879.

Hon. Mr. HARDY said that salaries voted this year would not be affected.

In reply to Mr. Meredith,

Hon. Mr. HARDY further said that the salaries would of course be classified but none reduced forthwith. It would require a year's time to mature the scheme, which must not be handled harshly, hurriedly, or rashly.

Mr. MEREDITH—You can do nothing until 1879.

Hon. Mr. FRASER—The preliminaries can be arranged.

Mr. MERRICK said that as it now was there might be several head clerks in each department, and so the appropriation be exceeded. The Act could also be used for covering up increased salaries. If the object of carrying this Bill was to increase those salaries that were under the average he could see why the Government wanted to pass the Bill, otherwise the Bill should be thrown out.

Hon. Mr. HARDY said that sec. 7 which was terrifying his honourable friend was an exact transcript of the Dominion law. The members of the House would have the opportunity of exercising a supervision over these items of expenditure. One of the chief objects of the Bill was that the position of clerks must be fixed by statute, and that they may not be affected by the whim, caprice, and good or bad will of the party for the time being in power.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) said the one effect of the Bill would be to increase the salaries of the young men in the departments. Special allowances might be made in special cases in preference to increases. He objected to another feature, that of giving persons power regardless of 'special adaptability.' He thought something should be done in reference to the remuneration of the messengers of the House.

Mr. LAUDER was entirely opposed to any increase of the expenses of the House. We wanted equalization, and not a levelling-up. These resolutions exhibited the Reform party's usual fondness for Orders in Council. They had since coming into power taken upon themselves to spend without law the people's money by Orders in Council. In the resolutions there is not a single movement to be made except by Orders in Council. The Reform party in times past opposed Orders in Council, and The Globe had always advocated that no expenditure of the people's money should take place without a direct vote of the House, unless in exceptional cases. The scheme will in future be brought down backed by Orders in Council, and hon. gentlemen opposite will have to adopt the scheme as a whole or risk a vote of want of confidence. The expenses of the Civil Service have been nearly doubled since the accession of the Reform party to power. He did not see why hon. gentlemen should be deprived of the privilege of criticism of each individual salary. He deprecated analogy being instanced between the Dominion House and this. Here steps should yet be taken to bring the control of the expenditure of money still nearer to the people. This system of managing affairs by Orders in Council would, he thought, create dissatisfaction, and lead to agitation for a legislative union.

Mr. HODGINS said that the Government adopts a general principle, and the Executive Council is responsible for carrying it out. The Order in Council is the written tangible evidence of the Council's having carried out its principle. As far as he understood, the purpose of this Bill was to limit the power of the Executive. Whatever determination the Council may come to within these limits, and make by Order in Council, is subject to a vote of the Legislature, and must be ratified by it. Though there has been an increase in the expenditure there has been an increase in the revenue and

volume of business. (Hear, hear.) The Reform Government succeeding Sandfield Macdonald conducted the business at least one per cent. less than that economical Government. He asked the House to adopt the principle of the Bill.

Mr. McMAHON thought that the Bill might have as well in the meantime been left alone. He objected to section 31, having reference to sheriffs, registrars, &c. He thought that the Government must have made some appointments which they should not have made. He would feel it his duty to oppose the Bill if this clause was not expunged. The people of this country do not find fault with the pittance of the clerks, though they do find fault with the indemnity of members and salaries of Ministers. He wished to see the messengers brought into the Bill. It was degrading for a sheriff, in his idea, to go before a county judge to be examined.

Hon. Mr. CURRIE said that ever since he had entered public life he had been in favour of a Civil Service Bill, and that of the strictest. He would like to see each young man placed in such a position as would enable him to reach the topmost rung of the ladder by ability, diligence, and attention. He approved of clerks being beyond the whims of the Ministry of the day. He could not endorse the idea of sheriffs, etc., having to stand an examination before a county judge. He hoped the Government would drop that part of the Bill. He would suggest in reference to sec. 36 that Sheriffs be also made to give a return under oath, as bailiffs are by that section to do. He thought that the House should affirm the principle that an efficient officer should be independent of either party.

Mr. WILSON said that at the present moment it did not appear to him necessary to have this Act. He also objected to it on account of having so many references to the exercise of the power known as the Order in Council. He did not approve of the examination of sheriffs, &c., by county judges, who themselves are in some instances not too well able to stand an examination. There is a strong desire in the counties to have the election of their own officers. He hoped that the honourable Provincial Secretary would strike out a number of these obnoxious clauses, and make the Bill more what it purports to be, a Bill in the interests of the Government's employees.

Mr. MILLER said that in reading over the Bill he at first thought that it would take a great deal of the control of the Civil Service out of the hands of the Government in power, but from the remarks of the Opposition it would appear that the opposite was the case. They were assuming that every clerk would receive \$1,400 per year. He contended that the power the Government would have in regard to chief clerks was simply one that would properly encourage those who were in office, and no one could more properly or more judiciously make these advances than the Government of the day. The Bill simply removed from the Government the power to exercise favour or disfavour. The salaries paid to chief clerks by this rich Province were not equal to those paid by many private firms, where the duties were not nearly as responsible as those of the chief clerks of Departments. If the provisions of the Bill were honestly carried out, the result would be to diminish salaries in general, and the only class of persons who would have reason to complain were those employed in the Civil Service. He had personally some slight objection to the 31st clause of the Bill, regarding examinations, but after all he thought that it might not be seriously objected to when put into practice. He would rather be in favour of the insertion of a superannuation clause in the Bill. He had seen very old employees of the Government in most impecunious circumstances.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) regretted that the Provincial Secretary should have introduced such a Cabinet-like Bill, which, he asserted, was cast-iron, and he hoped that it would be withdrawn. He thought that it was not required that first-class clerks should be employed in second or third-class positions. It only required to know who should have charge of the Departments to know who should be in the employment of the Govern-