

to take it, he said that it would have been unfair to let the whole Province have the benefit of it, as it belonged really to the city which he represented. He had given the money as a donation to the Hospital, and therefore his name had not appeared in connection with it. He claimed that the conversation was really a private one, and that he had stated to the hon. gentleman that he was the first person to whom he had spoken of the matter.

Mr. FRASER ridiculed the idea of the hon. gentleman being so particular in keeping his name from appearing in connection with the gift of the money, and then coming and in the hearing of several gentlemen speaking of it so that all might hear.

Mr. SINCLAIR said it seemed strange to hear with what ease the gentlemen learned in the law got over the rule of the House prohibiting members from using language which would be offensive to others. They spoke of the epithets which they would use towards each other were they outside the walls of the House. When he heard them speaking thus he sometimes wished they would go outside and use the words they spoke of, or if they felt it incumbent upon them to retain their places, that they would not attempt to violate one of the best rules of the House under such a flimsy pretense. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) In the matter of the indemnities, he thought the Government had been ill-used. He then pointed out the circumstances under which the increase had been made, and how the motion of the Treasurer to reduce them to the old standard had been defeated. He considered the course of the Opposition not by any means a fair and manly one.

Mr. MORRIS said that it was perfectly obvious that when the session opened the Government had no intention of reducing the indemnity, and were only forced to do so by the strong opposition to the increased amount exhibited in the country and by members on that side of the House. He believed the country would give them no credit for making the decrease. He regretted that conversations which had occurred outside of the House had been introduced into the debates, and trusted that the example that had been set to-night would not be followed.

Mr. MOWAT pointed out the strangeness of the position taken by the hon. gentlemen who had just sat down, that it did away with the propriety of the action of the Government that the decrease was made in obedience to the wish of the people. He was surprised also at an old Parliamentarian like the hon. gentleman blaming the Government for not inserting a reference to the indemnity in the Speech from the Throne. It would have been quite out of place to promise a decrease there. The hon. gentleman had also stated in the most positive manner that the Government had had no intention, before the House met, of decreasing the indemnity. The hon. gentleman could have no possible means of knowing the intentions of the Government on the matter. They had had the matter under consideration before the opening of the House, and had determined that they could not take any other course than that which they had adopted. The increase in the indemnity had certainly not originated with the Government, and it had only been decided upon on the understanding that it would be fully concurred in by all the members. The Government had been waited upon by deputations of members asking for an increase, and they had acceded to the request.

Mr. DEACON contended that the Government were bound to give the Opposition notice that they intended to reduce the amount of the indemnity, in the same way that the Opposition had given the Government notice in a former session that they intended to move for a reduction. The fact that the sum for indemnity to members was the same in the estimates for 1879 as it had been in 1878 was a proof that the Government had not intended to reduce the sum.

Mr. WOOD narrated the circumstances under which the Government increased the indemnity. He asked the Opposition whether it was not a matter of fair play that the Government should have had the same frank notice that the Opposition intended

to move to reduce the indemnity as they had had of the desire of the members to have it increased. He explained the manner in which the sum appeared in the estimates at the same amount which was paid in 1878. The estimates for 1879 were printed with the same figures opposite the items as in 1878, and when changed to the figures at which they now stood the total was left the same as in 1878.

Mr. MEREDITH asked when the change in the figures was made.

Mr. WOOD said the policy of the Government was so well understood that he himself had changed the figures without consulting his colleagues, as was the practice with other items.

Mr. MEREDITH asked whether it was made before or after the meeting of the House.

Mr. WOOD said that he was not prepared to say whether it was made a week before or the week after the meeting of the House.

Mr. SCOTT said that the hon. Attorney-General had placed the matter in an entirely new light. It appeared that the House had been acting a farce during the earlier part of the session, which might have been prevented by the Government's announcing the policy which they had, it seemed, intended to pursue in regard to the indemnity. He contended that the Government should have given the Opposition notice of their intention to make a reduction.

Mr. FRASER said that the manner in which the motion made in the earlier part of the session was brought forward was what he censured, and he would not have objected if the Opposition had given notice that at a future stage they would move to reduce the amount. The breach of faith on the part of hon. members opposite was the bringing forward as a motion of want of confidence a resolution condemning the Government for what they themselves were equally responsible for. He had always defended the increase in the indemnity, and he would always continue to do so, and he thought that if members of the House had stood by one another, public sentiment would not have gone so strongly in the direction in which it had gone.

Mr. MEREDITH contended that the legitimate conclusion from the action of the Government was that they had endeavoured to gain credit for a reduction in the indemnity. He pointed out that no member of the Government had during the debate on the motion moved by the hon. member for South Simcoe given any intimation that they intended to place a reduced sum in the estimates for 1879 for indemnity to members. If any such notice had been given the motion of the hon. member for South Simcoe would have been at once withdrawn. It had been said that the leaders of the Opposition had spoken in favour of the increase. He admitted that they had, but he called on the hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands to say whether they had not done so in consequence of some statements which he had made.

Mr. McLAWS said that members opposite had said that no one on that side of the House was prepared to move a reduction in the indemnity. He himself had been pledged to move in the matter, and there were hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who were well aware of the fact.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) moved that the item in the estimates, "Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, \$400," be struck out. He also gave notice that in Concurrence he would move that the amount in the estimates to be voted for the Inspector of Registry Offices be struck out. He would thus give hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity of exhibiting their desire for economy. He been charged with not stating that he would move for a reduction in the indemnity. He quoted from a report of his speech in the *Norfolk Reformer* to show that he had declared his intention of moving at the proper time to have the indemnity reduced. The hon. member for North Renfrew had also charged him with being the author of the round-robin, but he stated advisedly that that was true as the statement he had just now nailed as false to the counter. He had been told that that hon. gentleman was one of the parties who had pressed the Government to