

referred to the report of the Commission on the United States Civil Service, and said that his report had been quoted over and over again by such men as Charles Francis Adams, Carl Schurz, Dr. Woolsey, as showing that the terrible corruption in the American civil service was mainly due to the inadequate salaries paid in the different Departments. The security of the public service in any democratic country demanded that in all branches of that service there should be at least a fair amount of remuneration to those who gave up their time and attention for the public benefit. He maintained that on consideration it would be found that the members of this House had individually more work to perform than the members of the House of Commons at Ottawa. There were a great many questions coming within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature which were not touched upon at all by the House of Commons. In the latter the chief matters dealt with were those of policy, in which the chief responsibility rested upon the Government, while here each individual was far more immediately responsible to his constituents for each vote he cast. Any one who would contrast the amount of work which had been performed in this Chamber since 1867, with that accomplished by the House of Commons during the same period, would see that a far greater amount of labour for which members were individually responsible to their constituencies had been done here than at Ottawa. He did not think that \$800 was an amount at all in excess of a proper remuneration. (Hear, hear.) If there was to be any difference between the indemnity to members of the House of Commons and that to the members of this Legislature, the difference should be in favour of the members of this House. (Hear, hear.) It was not only the duties they had to perform during the session that required their time and attention, but there were duties which had to be gratuitously performed by hon. members every month in the year almost, and which had an intimate connection with the welfare of the people in their constituencies. He referred to matters connected with the Crown Lands and other departments. As he had stated when the increase had been proposed last session, he believed that if it were necessary that the services of members should be gratuitously given to the country, there was not an hon. member on either side of the House who would not be patriotic enough to render these services without any remuneration; but if it became a question of remuneration at all, then the amount should be a fair one. The imputation of selfish motives which had been made in the discussions on this matter in the country he utterly disclaimed, so far as every hon. member was concerned. It was very easy to raise a cry of salary grab, but all experience tended to show that it was desirable in any constitutional system of government the representatives of the people should be placed above the probability of temptation. The Government had determined to take their present action believing that public opinion had not been intelligently formed upon the question, and hoping that its reconsideration would result in a conclusion that those who devoted themselves to the interests of the Province were entitled to a fair amount of remuneration. If, after giving the matter a fair consideration, the people believed that \$600 was a proper amount of compensation for their representatives in the House, upon them would rest the responsibility.

Mr. CAMERON thought the arguments of the hon. member were such as to induce members to vote against the reduction. Such a course on the part of the Government was scarcely commendable. He had always said in his speeches in the country that the Opposition were partly responsible for the increase in the indemnity; but he did not consider it just that the Government, finding the measure unpopular, should throw the responsibility of making a reduction on the House, and should use argument in favour of the present scale. He believed that the indemnity should never be high enough to be an inducement, but merely sufficient to protect members against positive loss. As the Treasurer had referred to the House of Commons, he (Mr. Cameron) trusted that it would be proposed that their scale might be reduced proportionately. He was prepared to vote for the reduction.

Mr. MEREDITH said that no doubt a large section of the community had pronounced against what was done last session, and he thought that in a matter of this kind they must bow to the wish of the public. He wished it distinctly understood that he

accepted fully the responsibility of what was done last session. It had been said that he had been induced to take action in the matter by interested motives. He repudiated the assertion. Nothing he had done would justify hon. members saying that he had been influenced by any other motive than a conscientious one. He did not believe that hon. members would think he could be so base as to attempt to make a little cheap popularity at their expense. He might be wrong in the course he had taken, but at all events the House would give him the credit of being sincere.

Mr. HARDY thought that the Government had done wisely in listening to the voice of the community. He did not believe when the increase of \$200 was passed that mercenary motives would be imputed to the House. He would move, "That the whole indemnity be struck out," and members could show they could serve their country disinterestedly. (Applause)

Mr. LAUDER thought that the salaries of the members of the Administration should form part of the motion. At least some reasonable reduction should be made in their salaries. He had heard more objections raised against the increase of the salaries of the Executive, and should move "That these be restored to their former figure." He would support the motion of the hon. member for Brant. He did not think, however, that the people really objected to the \$800 indemnity.

Mr. BODGINS pointed out that there was more in the motion of the hon. member for Brant than the House perhaps saw. It really affirmed the principle that no member of Parliament should receive pay. This was the cardinal principle adopted in the English House of Commons, and no member there was allowed to receive pay, directly or indirectly, for his services. They had adopted a system similar to that of England, and why not do it in detail? Even the rules of the House were based on the same principle. Rule 16 stated that no member was entitled to vote on any question in which he had a pecuniary interest, and his vote on such a question could be disallowed. Could it be said that the members of the House had no pecuniary interest in the indemnity question. They might perhaps strike out the indemnity, but would the rule permit them to increase it? Apart from this point, he was prepared to take the full responsibility of the vote made last session. He believed that many members lost by reason of their holding seats in the House. There were members on both sides to whom the indemnity was in no way a compensation for the loss they endured in being members of Parliament. Therefore, he contended that the arrangement made last session was only just to these gentlemen. But his honourable friends had seemed to indicate that deference had to be paid to public opinion. He differed from them in regard to the limit of their responsibility to the public. The point to be considered was whether the question was one of principle or one of detail. It was a question of principle whether there should be any indemnity. If public opinion declared there ought to be no indemnity, then he thought the House would be bound to submit to public opinion. If, on the contrary, public opinion allowed an indemnity, then the details of that indemnity was not a matter on which they must defer to public sentiment. The House must use its own judgment as to the details, subject alone to its constituents at the polls. If the matter was to be judged on its merits, and the well recognized Parliamentary rule was adopted, it was their duty to carry it out to its logical conclusion, and their services to the country would be given on the same terms as in the English Parliament.

Mr. MILLER considered it significant that the anxiety to keep up Ministers' salaries was evinced by Ministers or expectant ministers. He was prepared to vote for the motion of the member for West Brant. At the same time, he did not think the people cared one straw for the increase in the indemnity, but were content that their representatives should receive a fair and an honest remuneration. With regard to the legal gentlemen, he thought they suffered least by representing constituencies, as they often gained a good deal of business in connection with the legislation of the House. Commercial men, on the contrary, were great losers. He was prepared to vote for the total abolition of the indemnity, but if that were lost he should oppose the reduction, as he did not believe in cheese-paring of this description. He could justify his vote for the \$800 before his