

said—and he removed from him any atom of blame in regard to the proposal of hon. gentlemen opposite—

In consequence of certain statements in the press, he considered it his duty to state that he himself had suggested the increase of Ministers' salaries—(hear, hear)—and he believed that the members of the Government were not sufficiently paid, as he had stated when the matter was discussed with closed doors. And he considered it unfortunate that it was discussed with closed doors, as the votes of hon. gentlemen should be made known, and as the country should know that they did not disapprove of the course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. Cameron had thus left upon record his unbounded disapproval of the course which was now proposed to be followed by the Opposition. The report of the *Mail* proceeded:—

With reference to the indemnity of members, \$800 was, in his judgment, not more than adequate to compensate them for the labour and attendance, and in many cases it was too little. At the same time, he was not desirous of granting any sum that would be an inducement for any class of the community to seek admission for what remuneration they might get. In every other respect he did not consider \$800 too much. Therefore, he wished to assume any responsibility that attached to the Government with reference to the matter. He did not know whether hon. gentlemen opposite desired to say anything further. He spoke only individually, and not for the Opposition. The rest could speak for themselves.

Those who sat in the front benches on the Opposition side, who voted in favour of the present motion, would have to vote against their own expressed opinion as well as against that of the gentleman who was at that time their leader. He undertook to say that if that gentleman were in the House to-day he would stand by the opinions he had expressed upon this question. (Opposition members, "No, no.") That gentleman he was sure would not now say anything to bring condemnation upon the Government side of the House for having followed the course which he had not only approved but suggested. (Hear, hear.) What had the present leader of the Opposition said upon this question when it was being debated? The *Mail* was satisfied with giving him a few lines, saying merely:—

Mr. MEREDITH concurred in the above observations.

What were these observations? They were that the members of the Government were not sufficiently paid; that the Opposition did not disapprove of the course of the Government, and that the indemnity of members was not sufficient to compensate them for their labour and attendance. The leader of the Opposition, if he spoke in this debate, would be bound to say that in the session of 1876, in his place in the House, he assented to the proposed increase of salaries and indemnities; that he was a party to it, and that now he came forward and asked the House to condemn the Government, and that in such a way that the Government could not place on record its opinion, be that opinion what it might. The *GLOBE* report of this gentleman's speech was rather longer, but members of the House would know when they heard it that there was nothing reported that he had not said:—

Mr. MEREDITH said, though he had made no remark in reference to the matter when it had been discussed with closed doors, he wished to say that he entirely concurred in the observations made by hon. members on both sides of the House as to the propriety of the course the Government had taken. He felt that the salaries paid to members of the Government were not adequate to the important duties they were called upon to fill. With regard, also, to the increase in the indemnity of members, he felt strongly the House would be compromising its dignity if it did not unanimously concur in the resolution.

Mr. LAUDER—That's THE GLOBE.

Mr. FRASER—Yes, that is THE GLOBE, and it is no stronger than the *Mail*; and I say that the man who said that, even by giving his consent to this motion, asks the House to condemn the Government for doing that which he himself asked them to do. And what had the member for Peterborough, who knew something about the origin and drafting of the amendment to the amendment, said in the debate from which he had been quoting? The *Mail's* report was as follows:—

Mr. SCOTT said he had not said anything when the matter came up for discussion, as he did not approve of the doors being closed, and so he concurred in the proposition. He did not see why hon. gentlemen in this House should not receive the same indemnity as members of the House of Commons of Canada. They were away from their homes as long, and the duties they performed were as important—to the Province of Ontario at least.

That was what his own organ had said of his speech, and now this gentleman came down and was one of the prime movers in an endeavour which sought to condemn what he himself had agreed in. To men of honesty and intelligence it would be ex-

ceedingly difficult for him to make it appear that he was right then, and right now well. THE GLOBE report of Mr Scott's speech stated:—

Mr. SCOTT said he had been opposed to having this matter discussed with closed doors, especially as he concurred in the general expression of opinion on both sides of the House. He had been of opinion before he had become a member of the House that the salaries of Ministers of the Crown in Ontario were not adequate to the position. With regard to the increased indemnity to members, he was also prepared to justify that, for he could not see why hon. gentlemen in this House were not entitled to the same measure of indemnity as the members of the House of Commons. The work was as important to the Province of Ontario as the work of the House of Commons was, and it was equally onerous to members.

The next member of the Opposition reported in the *Mail* was the hon. member for North Grey, of whom it was said

Mr. CREIGHTON was in favour of the advance. It was not stated whether he was in favour of going further or not, but certain it was he was in favour of the proposed increase. (Applause and laughter.) Following him was the hon. member for North Hastings, who was reported in the *Mail* in the following words:—

Mr. BOULTER remarked that the millennium would never arise in the House; but they at last all seemed to have hit upon something that was popular. It was a popular movement. (Laughter.) He was reported much in the same way in THE GLOBE—

Mr. BOULTER said they had at last struck upon a subject upon which they could all agree. (Laughter.) He believed this was a move in the right direction, and one which he believed the country would sustain.

Another prominent man of the Opposition, the gentleman who was member for South Simcoe before the present member, spoke upon this point. He was one who knew the duties and responsibilities of Ministers, and who knew what indemnity should be given to members. Of his speech the *Mail* speaks as follows:—

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) expressed indifference as to the remarks of the morning newspapers on this matter. He had no more respect for the opinion of a gentleman who sat in his room and wrote for a newspaper than he had for gentlemen who sat in the House and expressed their opinions publicly. (Hear, hear.) For his part, if his constituents did not consider that his services were worth \$500 they might get somebody else. He favoured the increase.

He (the speaker) wondered whether the present member for South Simcoe in referring to this question in his election speeches undertook to "emphasize" the conduct of his predecessor. If he did not condemn the former member, why not; and why did he now seek to condemn the Government for following out the policy of which he had so strongly expressed his approval? Could he justify one without justifying the other? The speaker quoted a fuller report from THE GLOBE, in which the same views were expressed. The case, as presented by the amendment to the amendment now under consideration, was that one party to the offence proposed to hang the other. (Laughter.) The speaker from the Opposition side who was reported as having next spoken in the debate in question was the member for East Grey, who might be said to be the prime mover in the present attempt to censure the Government. Of him the *Mail* says:—

Mr. LAUDER concurred in the observations of his colleagues.

He got up and deliberately approved of the increase, and had accepted the increased indemnity for three sessions and never placed on record his disapproval or remonstrance. If the hon. member for Dundas intended to speak upon this question he could furnish him with a text, for he knew none that would suit better than that they had preached from in favour of the increased salaries and indemnity. The mover of the present amendment to the amendment, the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Parkhill) had been a mere figure-head in the matter; some other monkey had been using his paws to pull the chestnuts out of the fire. (Applause.) He would draw the attention of the House to the way in which the amendment to the amendment was moved. The amendment had no sooner been proposed than the hon. member jumped up in his place, and, with his heart in his throat, submitted the amendment to it, and this, as the members knew, shut off the chance of fair discussion, and plainly the whole matter had been arranged with this view. The faces of the occupants of the Opposition front benches showed that the matter was part of a scheme. The different handwritings in which it was prepared showed that it had been written and space left for the