

stating the amount of their incomes; but no such chance was afforded the poor official.

Mr BLAKE—He has no chance to lie.

Atty-General MACDONALD said that was not the view to take of it. He would read the petition of the Civil Service employees of Ottawa on this subject. (Here the hon. member read the petition, which set forth that many of the wealthiest merchants in Ottawa were not assessed on their incomes at all.) He continued. The assessor was the creature of the Corporation, and as the schedule attached to this petition would prove they showed partiality to the members of the Corporation. Nine of the Aldermen of Ottawa were not taxed at all on their incomes. He protested in the strongest terms against any change in the law.

Mr LYON said some, at least, of the statements in the petition were incorrect. The petition from the citizens of Ottawa would show the matter in another light.

Mr BLAKE said his hon. friend advanced a most extraordinary argument and pursued a very strange course with respect to this matter. He had hurried up the printing of this petition and now occupied the time of the House (which was so valuable) in reading it over again when the hon. gentleman took the position that because certain persons in Ottawa, through inadvertence or partiality, had not been assessed, these officials should not be taxed. It was all very well to find fault with the manner in which property and income in Ottawa were assessed; but he wondered how the people of Cornwall were taxed. He did not doubt but the hon. member could give just as interesting a history of the assessment in Cornwall as of Ottawa. The same might be said of Brantford and other places. It was the same everywhere. People would avoid taxation, if possible. But there was a law in existence to regulate such matters. If it was desired to have these people taxed, this law should be resorted to for the purpose; but let the hon. member not take the ground that because the present law was not properly administered certain persons should not be taxed. There was little doubt that matters would improve in Ottawa when things come to the worst they will mend. The very publicity given to the matter lead to that result. The hon. member said because these men were Government employees they should be exempted—because they found it hard to get on in some way, and other people than Government employees had to educate their children, and they might claim exemption with equal justice. The effect of the statement of the hon. member was, that the salaries of these officials were not sufficiently high. It might be so, but this was not the way to relieve them. But, the hon. gentleman observed, they did not receive their salaries from the municipalities, and they should therefore not be taxed by them. Did the hon. gentleman suppose that the merchant derived his income from the Corporation. The merchant certainly did not receive it from Government, but from the country. (Hear, hear.) So with Government officials. They got their salaries from the country—from the people. So did everybody. The principle was this. A man had his place of business and residence in some particular place, and had all the advantages of improvements made by the expenditure of the public money, and it was his means, to the municipal burdens of that place. The effect of the exemption clause was to say that the Government of Ontario had a right to tax the city of Toronto just to the extent to which these officials were exempted from taxation. Now, it was all very well to say that the city of Toronto derived great advantage from the expenditure of the public money, in the shape of the clerks' salaries here. But Toronto derived advantage from the expenditure of the income of Messrs. Gooderham and Worts in the city, yet the hon. member would not go so far as to say that this firm should not be taxed because the city of Toronto derived such benefits from the capital invested by the firm in the city. Last year, when this matter was before the House, the representatives of Ottawa and Toronto asked the House to exempt the salaries of Government officials residing in these cities from taxation. He took pains to ascertain if it were really the desire of the people, and being satisfied it was so, he voted for the exemptions, and he would do so again, if he believed the corporations interested in the matter were in favour of it. But when he saw the representatives of these two cities now come forward and ask on behalf of their constituents to have the exemption clause repealed, he would support them.

Mr. WALLIS said, last session he was instructed by the citizens of Toronto to ask for this exemption, but since then he had learned differently. The people had since then expressed a desire to have the officials taxed like other people, he would therefore vote to have the exemptions removed.

Hon. Mr. WOOD contended that it would be giving an advantage to the citizens of Ottawa and Toronto at the expense of the whole country. There were not less than \$1,000,000 spent each year at Ottawa in salaries, &c., and yet they wanted to increase it in this way.

Mr. MCKELLAR said the hon. gentleman's argument seemed to premise that the clerks could not pay their taxes out of their present salaries, but he (Mr. McK.) contended that they were able.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said they ought to lower them and give the benefit of the reduction to the whole country.

Mr. BLAKE said the salaries were fixed before they were exempted.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said this was not the case. He believed they ought not to vote for an exemption which would subject the country to a tax for the benefit of the citizens of Toronto or Ottawa.

Mr. COYNE was in favour of sweeping away all exemptions. He would be in favour of taxing schools and churches, and would go farther than the Bill proposed.

Mr. RYKERT was not in favour of joining in this crusade against ministers. He proposed an amendment that the salary of a minister, while in actual connection with any church, should be exempted up to \$1,000, and the parsonage or dwelling occupied by him, and the lands thereto attached, not exceeding two acres, and not exceeding \$2,000 in value.

Mr. OLIVER asked the hon. member to make it one-fifth of an acre instead of two acres. They were going so far in the opposite direction from that which they went last session.

Mr. LYON said the city of Ottawa had never made any offer to exempt these officials. It had never petitioned in favour of these exemptions. He had, as he had said, received a telegram from the Ottawa Board of Trade, stating that they were preparing a petition repudiating the charges of the other petition. He was placed in it as a member of the Board of Trade, while he held no such position. He believed it was as great an advantage to the farmers of the country that the seat of the Government was in the city as it was to the city itself.

Mr. SCOTT (Ottawa) said that he read to the House a telegram last year from the Mayor of Ottawa, to the effect that the city were prepared to exempt the officials from taxation. On his return to the city, he found that this conclusion was not a general one, and that the city was generally opposed to the exemption, and insisted to have their salaries taxed as well as the other inhabitants of the city.

After some further discussion, the amendment providing for exemption of the incomes of clergymen and their houses, was carried.

Atty.-Gen. MACDONALD moved an amendment that subsection 25, of section nine, should be allowed to stand. It provides that official salaries should be exempted in the cities of Toronto and Ottawa.

After considerable uproar the amendment was put and lost by 31 yeas and 33 nays, and the clause, so far as regards this section was then agreed to.

The remaining clauses were then agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON moved that sub section 2 of section 71 be rejected, but it was lost without a division.

Mr. CALVIN moved that sub section 19 of section 9 should be struck out. He thought that the farmers had as much claim for consideration as the rich money lender with a pile of mortgages in his hand, and ought not to be assessed on his farm as well as on his income. He expected that it would be found that on many occasions he would have no income at all, owing to adverse circumstances.

After a little conversation, the motion was withdrawn on the understanding that it would be brought up again on the third reading.

Some further discussion arose, and the Committee ultimately rose and reported.

### PUBLIC BUSINESS.

### THE HOUSE TO BE PROROGUED ON FRIDAY.

Atty. Gen. MACDONALD said he was prepared to fulfil the promise he had given the House as to the

announcement of the prorogation of the House. He thought that he was justified in the present state of public business in announcing to the House that His Excellency would come down on Friday afternoon, at three o'clock, to prorogue the House.

Mr. BLAKE asked the course the hon. gentleman proposed to take with regard to the Public Bills now before the House. It was impossible to get through the whole of them.

Atty. Gen. MACDONALD said the Government would see what progress was made to-morrow (Wednesday).

Mr. BLAKE said the Municipal Bill, the Jury Bill, and other measures, were very important. The House ought to be made acquainted with the Bills the hon. gentleman thought should be selected to go on with.

Mr. MCKELLAR called attention to the Railway Bills, and hoped that it was understood that they would come up again to-morrow.

Atty. Gen. MACDONALD said that they would be better able to declare the course to be adopted to-morrow.

The House adjourned at 12 20 this morning.