

the highest positions in this country, and there was hardly any position which was not open to them. In an arbitration any young lawyer, however small his experience or abilities, could claim a fee twice as large as that of the most able layman in the country. (Cheers.)

Mr. SCOTT said no doubt the hon., the Treasurer, would at some time have sufficient influence with his colleagues to induce them to reduce lawyer's fees. He thought the arguments of the hon. gentlemen were unworthy of him, and would reflect more upon him and his party than upon their opponents. It had been a complaint that the laymen were not sufficiently represented in the Government, and suggestions that this representation should be increased had come from the Opposition, but never from the Government side of the House. It was surely not exactly a very favourable thing to the laymen of the House, that five-sixths of the Cabinet were lawyers, and only one-sixth of them laymen. The argument about the surplus was an extraordinary one. Perhaps it was from the fact that there was a surplus that the salaries had been so greatly increased. As soon as this surplus was gone—and it had to go—we would be reduced to the unpleasant fact of direct taxation. The suggestion that this motion was aimed against the laymen of the country was still more unworthy of the hon. gentleman. When the salaries were increased some years ago was there any suggestion to reduce the lawyer's fees? If this had been done, there might be something in the suggestion now made. There was no parallel between the fees of lawyers and salaries of officials. The Government had nothing whatever to do with the fees of lawyers; that was a matter entirely between the lawyer and the client.

Mr. WOOD—I said taxable fees.

Mr. SCOTT continued—His hon. friend had said the lawyers made more money than other classes. He, however, pointed out that the eminent lawyers in this city were perhaps the only ones who were making money, and they were not so successful as merchants and others. The Attorney-General had waxed warm in the discussion of the matter, and had said that to take advantage of the fall in prices to decrease salaries was a most unstatesmanlike thing. The Attorney-General, in making that statement, was condemning himself and his own record, because he had not long ago taken advantage of a rise in prices to increase the salaries, and he (Mr. Scott) contended that the argument was just as forcible in one case as in the other. In the Attorney-General's own Department the salaries had very appreciably increased, having risen from \$7,600 in 1871 to \$11,660 in 1878. That increase had been justified upon the plea that prices had greatly risen, and he thought the same reason should now lead to a decrease.

Mr. FERRIS said that the position the hon. Treasurer had taken was that if hon. gentlemen on the front benches opposite were really in earnest in the desire to save money to the country, they would strike at the fees of that class which was built up and hedged about with legislation. The position of the legal profession was such that the hard times made no decrease in their emoluments, but on the contrary, it increased them. The result of that state of things ought to be that whenever hard times visited the country every member of the legal profession should immediately reduce his fees. It was said that hon. gentlemen of the long robe had saved enough out of their emoluments to accumulate the fund at the disposal of the Law Society, and to bind up the library at Osgoode Hall. But such a statement was not borne out by the facts, because the profession got back much more in the way of law reports than the sum they contributed in that way, so that in reality the money came out of the pockets of the people. He pointed out the radical difference between the position of the legal profession and that of the remainder of the people in being assured of their incomes to a certain extent by law. The grievances in this respect were not of recent standing and could not be remedied in a day, but it was contrary to the spirit of the institutions of the country that such a state of things should exist. He was of opinion that the sum that the hon. Treasurer had named as the saving that would result from a reduction of ten per cent. in legal fees was below the real figure. He protested against the outcry that had been made against the alleged extravagance of the Government in the matter at which the amendments were aimed. Of the normal Provincial revenue of nearly two millions, nearly one-half went back directly to the people, and was expended by agencies entirely beyond the control of the House. He did not wish to set class against class in the House or in the country, but when hon. members attacked laymen in the Civil Service, while refusing to accommodate their own fees to the state of the times, it was well to show the country the hollowness of their professions.

Mr. CURRIE proposed to vote both against the amendment and the amendment to the amendment. The latter motion was of a sweeping character, and was put forward, he supposed, with a view to alleviating hard times. (Hear, hear.) It was moved, he supposed, in the interests of the constituents of the hon. member for East Toronto. Among them nearly half a million dollars was expended by way of official salaries, and it was surely a direct way of benefitting them to curtail in comes in the way proposed. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Scott was appointed at a salary originally of \$1,600, and had the liberty when first appointed of exercising his profession. After he had served the Province one year Mr. Sandfield Macdonald raised his salary to \$2,000, and in 1873 the hon. member for North Renfrew had voted to raise it to \$3,000. He had not the slightest hesitation in saying that if Mr. Scott went out of his office to-morrow he would make two dollars in the practice of his profession for every one he was making now.

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

#### NORTH-WEST ONTARIO.

In the report of Mr. Mowat's speech on this subject in Tuesday's Globe Sir Edward Thornton was represented as occupying the position of representative of the Imperial Government in the arbitration. What was said was that he was chosen the third arbitrator between Ontario and the Dominion. In the same report the sum stated to have been paid by the United States for Alaska should have been \$7,200,000 instead of \$200,000. It may be added that the distance of 700 miles referred to in the speech is the distance from Lake Temiscamingu westward to the North-West Angle of the Lake of the Woods.

## MUNICIPAL ACT AMENDMENTS COMMITTEE.

TORONTO, March 4.

This Committee met this morning, Mr. Hardy, Chairman, presiding.

The amendments suggested by Mr. Chisholm at a former meeting, preventing traders from selling goods by auction out of the municipality in which they paid their taxes, was passed.

On motion of Mr. MILLS, an amendment was carried placing the expenditure upon police, so far as clothing and wages are concerned, under the control of the Council in cities of not more than 20,000 inhabitants.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL introduced a Bill providing for a number of amendments, as follows:—The county judge, sheriff, and such person as the Council shall appoint at their first meeting, shall constitute a Board for the revision of assessments, to whom appeals shall be made under certain forms; the Council of any municipality may offer a reward for the apprehension of criminals; persons interested in any Company shall not vote when a by-law is submitted to grant aid to that Company, in case of the location or boundary of a lot being uncertain the Township Council on being requested by the Inspector may cause a new map of the place to be drawn up, the cost to be levied against the lot in question.

The Bill which caused the most discussion was one introduced by Mr. McCrauey, providing that with a view to break the monopolies now existing it might be competent for the County Council to advertise their by-laws in any paper having a circulation in the municipality, leaving them free to decide. The Bill was amended to cover only the papers in the adjoining municipality.

WEDNESDAY, March 5.

This Committee met this morning, Hon. A. S. Hardy in the chair.

Mr. HARDY introduced a section to be added to the Municipal Act by which the Municipal Councils of cities of not more than 15,000 population may fix the number and settle the remuneration of the men constituting the police force, all such arrangements to be binding upon Boards of Police Commissioners. Adopted.

Mr. Monk's Bill, enacting that coroners' fees should be paid by the treasurer of the county when an inquest is held in the county, and by the treasurer of a city when a death occurs and the inquest held there, was carried.

Mr. Miller's Bill, providing that no damages shall be recovered in respect of trespasses committed by horses or cattle upon lands in Muskoka and Parry Sound where no by-law is in force, and where any by-law in that behalf is in force no damages shall be recovered unless the animal shall have jumped over a fence four feet six inches in height, the Act not to apply to unruly or breachy animals, was carried.

Mr. Sexton's Bill, No. 132, relating to the furnishing of accommodation to county officials, was consolidated with Bill No. 85.

Mr. Coutts' Bill proposing to include the costs of arbitration connected with drainage in municipal debentures issued for drainage purposes was carried.

Mr. Springer withdrew his Bill to allow towns to reduce the number of councillors in certain cases.

Mr. McWILLIAMS, City Solicitor of Toronto, asked to have a clause added to the Municipal Act by which City Councils should have the power of regulating shops for the sale of second-hand goods. The proposal was lost on a division. He also proposed that sections should be added to the Act giving City Councils and Boards of Police, where they have the power to issue licenses, the right to regulate the fees to be paid for such licenses, and to give City Councils power to enter into contracts extending over more than one year, such contracts not to be binding unless ratified by a three-fourths vote of the whole Council, and not to extend beyond ten years. The clauses were adopted. A proposal to relieve City Councils of the necessity of advertising by-laws other than money by-laws was rejected on a division. Clauses proposing to make sewer rates a tax upon property, and empowering City Councils to borrow money on other securities than promissory notes were adopted.

Mr. RICHARDSON pointed out that a change was required in the law to prevent an excessive number of candidates being put forward at municipal nominations.

The Committee resolved to recommend that no person should be allowed to be nominated for a municipal election unless with his express consent, and that candidates should be permitted to retire at any time between nomination and election by giving notice in writing to the Clerk.

The Committee adjourned at 10.55.