

Fraser) was prepared to show, at the proper time, that salaries had been so increased, and he instanced the Custom House officers at Toronto in proof. He thought it would be much more to the point if hon. gentlemen, instead of indulging in broad general charges, would point to a single individual whose salary had been improperly increased, or any officer appointed whose services were not required.

Mr. LAUDER said they were ready to do that at the proper time.

Hon. Mr. FRASER said the hon. gentleman was ready to do anything. He was even ready to state in the country that the Government had asked for an appropriation of \$125,000 for a particular purpose, while they had only asked for \$25,000. (Hear, hear.) When the hon. gentleman made that statement, he was either ignorant of the facts or something else, which he would not characterize, because it might not be quite parliamentary to do so. (Laughter.) He defended the increase of the salaries on the ground that everything else had increased in cost at the same ratio, and salaries in commercial houses had also grown very much greater. There was no man, in whatever capacity, who was not paid very much more money for his services than in 1867. Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's Government had promised an increase of salaries to civil servants in their departments, and had they been in office up to the present time, even although no such promise had been made, they would have been compelled to increase the salaries.

at Government had done. He stated that a great difference there was in the salaries of Quebec officials as compared to those in similar positions in Ontario. The hon. member for South Grey complained of the increase in the expense for legislation, but the hon. gentleman was himself every year reaping some of that increase, and he supposed he would not object to a further increase. (Cheers and laughter.) He repeated that when the return was brought down the exhibit would be such that the Government, instead of having any reason to fear it, would show the country that the public affairs were in this respect well and economically administered. (Cheers.)

Mr. SPEAKER trusted that no further reference in the course of this debate would be made to a previous debate.

Mr. BOULTBEE objected to the reference to the Ottawa and Quebec Governments, as the comparisons were, he considered, wide of the question. The Provincial Secretary had thrown in their faces the addition of the allowance to members which he (Mr. Boultee), however, did not think compensated the gentlemen who neglected their interests in coming to the House. He for one would be willing to support a motion for the reduction of the sessional allowance if it were brought forward.

Mr. PRINCE referred to the virulent opposition with which the Hon. Attorney-General's amendment had been met on the previous day and spoke with force upon the propriety of obtaining all the information that could be obtained on the subject. He had no doubt that when the return was brought down it would tell greatly in favour of the Government.

Mr. MCCALL was satisfied that the salaries and numbers of the officers had been largely and unnecessarily increased.

Mr. CAMERON thought the course the hon. Provincial Secretary had taken in referring to his (Mr. Cameron's) votes was absurd. His colleagues were not responsible for his votes, and were at liberty to take just what course they chose. The hon. gentleman was unfortunate in another of his suggestions. He had stated that he had supported the increases, but the journals of the House contained a motion of his in which he had objected to increases in the staff of the Public Works. He had no doubt that they would find, when the return was brought down, that there had been great extravagance in the departments of the Government.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said, with regard to the appointment in his Departments, which had been referred to, the strongest and most conclusive reasons were given why it should be made. Under the Conservative Government, Mr. Edwards was appointed Secretary of Public Works and Secretary of Emigration. By the system that was inaugurated under Mr. Blake's Government a large amount of money was spent in inducing emigrants to come to this country. A good deal of correspondence had necessarily to be carried on, and it was utterly impossible that Mr. Edwards, though a most efficient officer, could act in the double capacity. Hence the necessity for the appointment of Secretary of

Emigration, and he thought hon. gentlemen would agree with him that the salary to that official was not too much for one qualified for the place. He found hon. gentlemen argued quite differently in the House to what they did out of the House. From their speeches outside the House, it was clear they considered the late Government a perfect model, and he, of course, thought that the number of officials employed, and the salaries paid by that Government met with the approval of those gentlemen. In order to test the sincerity of this cry which had been raised, they desired to have a comparative statement. He happened to have in his possession a comparative statement, and he found that the cost of officers for legislation in the Dominion Parliament to be \$63,000, and in Quebec \$43,000, both of which sums exceeded the cost of the same class of officers in the employ of the Ontario Government. He thought the Government was pursuing the proper course in bringing down a comparative statement, particularly as hon. gentlemen opposite regarded the late Government as a model Government. He was convinced they would be able to show that the Ontario Government was much more economical than that Government. He would like to know which year, 1868, '69, or '70, hon. gentlemen wish to make particular comparison with, because he found by reference to the public records that the expenditure of the Sandfield Macdonald Government increased year by year.

Mr. LAUDER—You are quite wrong.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR maintained that he was perfectly correct, and went on to say that the cry which hon. gentlemen opposite were renewing would be as easily answered as it had been before. Last year it was stated that the Government had not a single farthing in the Treasury; but that was answered, and the people now knew there was not the slightest truth in the statement. He thought hon. gentlemen had better confine themselves to the discussion of proper subjects, and let this cry they were again getting up alone, because it would be contradicted every time, and proved false by the public documents of the country. (Cheers.)

Mr. RYKERT denied that the salaries increased under the Administration of Sandfield Macdonald, and objected to the amendment, which had been moved by the leader of the Government on the day previously. He considered that the Government should be willing to stand by the return of their own.

The motion was carried.

MUNICIPAL LOAN FUND.

Mr. LAUDER moved for a Return—(1.) Of copies of all Orders in Council passed during the year 1873, relating to the Municipal Loan Fund, and the Act of last Session relating thereto. (2.) All correspondence and telegrams between the Government and Municipalities, their officers or other persons, regarding the settlement of the said Municipal Loan Fund, and the said Act and Schedules thereto. (3.) A statement of all changes made in the Schedules to the said Act of last Session since the same passed to a third reading.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT said that a return which would contain all the information was being printed, and would speedily be laid before the House. He would, therefore, ask the hon. gentleman to allow it to stand over for a short time.

Mr. LAUDER consented to defer the motion.

APPORTIONMENT OF RENT.

Mr. BETHUNE moved the House into Committee on the Bill to amend the Law of Landlord and Tenant, and to provide for the Apportionment of Rent.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

The report was adopted.

THRESHING MACHINE ACCIDENTS.

Mr. CLARKE (Wellington) moved the second reading of the Bill to require owners of threshing and other machines to guard against accidents. He pointed out that within the last few years there had been a large increase in the number of threshing machine accidents, and they had become as common as railway accidents. Members representing rural constituencies would be aware that these accidents were principally caused by the absence of necessary guards enclosing dangerous portions of the machinery. He found no legislation had taken place upon the subject in England, but in several of the States such legislation had been most successful. In Wisconsin, accidents of this kind had been reduced fifty per cent.