

it was afterwards brought to him by a Conservative he had signed it because he believed there was honour in his own party. (Renewed laughter.) When the Minister of Education had moved a resolution for a reduction he voted with him; and there was no doubt that the Minister of Education would vote for this motion now, because it was the same as his own. (Cries of No, no.) He believed they both had the same object, and as for him, he would vote for the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. LYON said he had signed the round-robin, and he thought it was unfair for the Opposition to attempt to force hon. gentlemen to vote against what they had pledged themselves as in favour of. He had been sent here to support the Mowat Administration, and he saw no reason to cease to support them now. There were of course increases in the expenditure, but who objected to the various objects to which the expenditure was devoted? The Province's sources of revenue were still almost boundless; we had immense resources, and when the new country which had been acquired by the settlement of the boundary of the Province was opened up our resources would be vastly increased. It was unfair, unjust, and dishonourable to ask the House to vote the want of confidence in the Government by this resolution, and he was going to vote against it.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

After recess,

Mr. HARKIN thought the less legislation the Province had from the present Administration the better; for they only increased the expenses of administering without increased efficiency. The principle of self-preservation was the mainspring of any legislation introduced. The license law was passed to furnish the Government with canvassers—the license inspectors. The Government has taken \$60,000 of the license money from the people. For this all the people had was a law enforced in the worst possible manner. The Tile Drainage Act favoured the rich farmer to the detriment of the poor farmer. The feeling of the country was in favour of a reduction of the indemnity to members and the salaries of Ministers.

Mr. McCRAVEY congratulated the House and the Province upon the close of the boundary arbitration, and complimented the Attorney-General upon the case which he had presented before the arbitrators. He was not one of those who had signed the "round-robin." He did not know, being a new member, whether it was too much or too little, but he had consented to the increase. He had remained silent when the matter was brought before the House, and by so doing he took a share of the responsibility, which responsibility he was prepared to bear. (Hear, hear.) The conduct of the hon. member for East Grey was so inconsistent that he could not see how that gentleman would vindicate it before the country and before his constituents. He said that when he concurred with the members of the Government in increasing the indemnity he thought a bargain had been made with the members of the Ministry that they should stay at home and not go out stumping the country against his friends. (Hear, hear.) If the hon. gentleman thinks he can make any capital out of that he is welcome. The hon. member for North Essex had made a statement that many Government members would vote against the amendment to the amendment because they desired to keep the increased salary, but he believed that that would not be the reason for the votes they would cast. Both the seconder of the amendment and the seconder of the amendment to the amendment had voted against the Government resolution to reduce the indemnity, and he trusted that they would maintain the same principle by their vote in the present instance. He quoted from an article in the *London Herald*, published at the time of the increase of the indemnities, claiming that the members of the Opposition had done all they could to prevent the increase, but had been outvoted by the Government, and another article published since the opening of the present debate, stating that they could prove what they had said in the former article. Now, as the House sat with closed doors, the editor of the paper, if he had any proof, must have secured it from some hon. member.

Mr. TOOLEY—Does the hon. member

mean to have it understood that I gave that information?

Mr. McCRAVEY—I make no personal insinuation, but if the hon. member for East Middlesex thinks the cap fits him he is at perfect liberty to wear it. (Laughter.) If the Opposition had introduced a fair and honest motion to reduce the indemnity he would have supported them. He would not, however, vote in favour of an amendment of this kind, that would vote his party out of office. He deemed it far better to have the Hon. Mr. Mowat and his colleagues in power, even though they do not reduce the indemnities, than to allow the gentlemen on the other side of the House to secure the control of the affairs of the Province. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. WIGLE hoped he would never use the language which had been used by members on the Government side. It was a common thing for the Government party to cry buncombe whenever a subject was brought before the House by an Opposition member. When Provincial Treasurer Mr. Crooks had proposed a reduction in the indemnity of members. Was not that a buncombe resolution, especially when that gentleman also voted for the increase? The country would endorse the opinion of the late leader of the Opposition that the "whitewashing Bill" was a disgrace to the statute book. The Crooks Liquor Act was one of the most expensive Acts ever passed. The work which now cost \$1,000 for Essex was better done for \$200. He thought the allotment of licenses should be left with the municipal Councils. They knew the circumstances better than the Commissioners. He intended to vote for the reduction in indemnities.

Mr. BOULTER asked after all their debating what did it amount to? Simply that all the members of the House were responsible for the increase of the indemnity. The charge against the Opposition was that they had improperly brought up a proposal to reduce the salaries. It was the speech of the member for Stormont which had suggested the debate. He did not look upon the present motion as one of want of confidence in the Government. If they were in favour of a reduction they now had an opportunity of saying so. He did not wish to try to take any proper responsibility from the members of the Opposition. The increase had been made at the suggestion of the Government, and was accepted by the Opposition fairly; but there was no understanding as to how long it should last, and it was perfectly fair for any member to move a reduction to the old sum. He gave credit to the Government for their action in the boundaries question, and complimented them upon the result. He advocated a change in the school law looking toward a better and more permanent series of text-books. He spoke against the Voters' List Act, which had passed at the last session, claiming that it had been passed for the benefit of the Dominion Government. Referring to the speech of the Minister of Public Works, in which it was attempted to be shown that the suggestion to increase the indemnity had come from the Opposition, he showed in the reports of that debate that the members of the Government had favoured the increase. The newspapers of the country were not always to be depended upon, which was much to be regretted. Newspaper writers should be sure of their facts before attempting to instruct the public. For instance, a statement had been made in the *Mail* newspaper that the sessional allowance to members of the N. Y. State Legislature was only \$3 per day. He had taken great care to inform himself thoroughly upon the matter, and he found their allowance used to be \$10 per day or \$1,200 for the session, which law had been amended so as to make the allowance \$1,500. Again, the same newspaper had stated that the session of the Ontario House lasted only six weeks. Now he found in turning up the records that the average session of the first Parliament had been nine weeks and three days; the second Parliament had sat nine weeks and six days. In the third Parliament the only session shorter than six weeks (five weeks and four days) was recorded; but their average session covered fully nine weeks. True there was a recess of some days, but it really counted in with the session, for the members could not attend to business during that time. If the news-