

consistents.

Mr. HAY thought that the position taken by the Treasurer and the members for London and East Toronto would be found hard to be understood by the people. They all contended that the increase was right, and if this was their opinion they should be prepared as honest men to support their opinions. He would vote for the abolition of the indemnity, and if it were carried he would leave the House never to return. (Laughter.)

Mr. McMAHON attacked the course pursued by the Opposition as inconsistent. When the increase was proposed they had acquiesced in it, and had nevertheless indulged in clap-trap for political purposes. The leader of the Opposition now stated that he was misled in taking the course he pursued last session, and, influenced by the hon. member for London, had recanted what he had before said.

Mr. SNETSINGER said he refused last year to sign the round-robin calling for an increase. He was prepared to vote for the motion of the hon. member for Brant.

Mr. SCOTT could not support the resolution of the member for Brant. There was no analogy between the House of Commons of England and this House. They had no men of wealth here like in England, and if the indemnity were done away with many members, himself included, would be compelled to resign. With regard to the reduction, he entirely failed to see why members of this House were not entitled to as fair a remuneration as members of the House of Commons. The labour involved by the possession of a seat in this House was greater than that falling to the share of members of the House of Commons. He still held the same opinion as he expressed last session, and would vote against both motions.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) approved of the increase of last year, and had kept faith with his fellow members ever since. He defended the member for London against the charges made against him. He would vote for the amendment of the member for South Brant as a matter of conviction. He differed altogether from the member for East Grey about the salaries of Ministers, which had no connection with the indemnity question. Ministers were very much underpaid now, and he would rather increase their salaries than diminish them. He regarded sessional allowances as an un-British practice.

Mr. SINCLAIR said that he was glad that this discussion had taken place, as it would place hon. members right before the country. The conduct of some sections of the press with regard to this matter had been most disgraceful. So long as members of the House conducted themselves in a proper and becoming manner and sought to do their duty to their constituents, they should not have imputed to them such motives as some sections of the press had imputed to them with regard to the matter. As a member of the Reform party he could not support the motion of the member for Brant. If that motion carried the effect would be to allow only the rich men—lawyers and others—in the towns and cities to come out as candidates. If no remuneration were paid to members there might be a feeling among them that they were conferring a favour on their constituents, and a tendency to remunerate themselves in an improper manner. It would be well for the country to understand that members themselves could not raise their indemnity, and that no addition to the burdens of the country could be made without a message from his Honour. The members of this House deserved better treatment from the country than they had received with regard to this matter. He had not signed the round robin for the increase, but he had not opposed it in the House, simply because he believed there were other members whose services were well worth the higher figure. He thought it very unfair to the Government that members, after having urged the Administration to raise the indemnity, should now come down and say that the sentiments of the people would not justify the increased indemnity. It plainly showed that these members had deliberately misled the Government as to the feelings of the country, and on their shoulders the responsibility rested. For his own part he believed it would have been peculiarly to his advantage if he had never been elected a member of the House. Though he blamed the press of the country to a large extent for the manner in which this matter had been discussed, still there was a great deal of blame to be attributed to those members of the House who had systematically depreciated this Chamber by calling it

nothing more than a large County Council. This had caused a feeling in the country that their work was much the same as in a County Council, and that their remuneration should be about in the same proportion. Many people actually believed that a person who was competent to act as the warden of a county was well qualified to be the Attorney-General of Ontario. For his part he believed the Attorney-General in this House required to be as good a lawyer and to have as great ability as the Minister of Justice in Ottawa. (Hear, hear.) He had been pained to hear some of his constituents speak as if the Attorney-General was overpaid. He would be prepared to take the full responsibility of voting for a considerable increase in the salaries of the Ministers, as he believed their abilities and the importance of their duties would justify such an increase.

Mr. SEXTON said that those members who averred that they had not signed the round robin for the increase had not chosen to refuse the \$200. (Hear, hear.) The cry of salary-rab had not been raised with regard to the increase of the indemnity at Ottawa. He argued that the duties of members of this House were fully as important as those of members of the House of Commons. During the last nine sessions, the sessions of the Local House extended over 638 days, and the sittings over 402 days; in the House of Commons the sessions extended over 540 days and the sittings over 425 days. The average number of Acts passed each session was 105 in this House and 85 in the House of Commons. He argued that the legislation of this House was more important than that of the Commons. Either the members of the Legislature got too little, or those of the Commons too much. He was opposed to any reduction in the salaries of Ministers. He asked the House if it did not think the Premier of Ontario was worth more than one-half of that of the Premier of the Dominion. He was prepared to sustain the Government in whatever action they took in this matter.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) was glad that the question was fairly before the House and the public. It had been said that the public opinion was that they had abused the trust reposed in them. He denied this. The agitation was raised by a few newspaper writers for political purposes, but among the sensible, intelligent electors there was no such feeling as had been said to exist. But if such a sentiment did exist in a few localities, were they to be deterred from doing right to themselves and the public? There was no other Assembly that could determine what salary they were to receive. Were they to go to the country and confess they were not worth the paltry sum in question? At the House of Commons the increase of compensation and Ministerial salaries was consented to by both sides, and was received with silence by the press and the public. He regretted that the Government had not sufficient backbone to stand by their own Act. Why did they ask the House to go to the country, and confess themselves robbers? Surely the action now taken was a piece of political clap-trap, and would be so regarded by the people. On the other side, it was notorious that men went to the Legislature with the expressed object of making money. He quoted in support of his assertion from a work written by Mr. Jennings, published in the United States, in which the open bartering of votes and the general corruption, bribery, and fraud practised in the State Legislatures were frankly admitted and deplored. He also quoted statements from the New York papers to the same effect, and said that the same results would follow here if public servants were inadequately remunerated. He was glad to say that such effects had so far been unknown in this country. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for North Bruce, he (Mr. Macdougall) had had occasion in speaking of the functions and jurisdiction of this Legislature to liken it to a large municipal Council. That comparison, made in the sense in which he had made it, was, he believed, a correct one. But that did not affect the fact that the matters dealt with by this Legislature were of the utmost importance—matters affecting our educational interests, our municipal affairs, the regulations of our liquor houses, questions immediately concerning the lives and morals of the people. All of these were of more immediate importance to the people than questions regarding postal administration, banking, and so on. He would vote for the estimates as they had been submitted to the House, and if his services were not worth \$800 to his constituents they could get some one else to represent them.