

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

THIRD PARLIAMENT—FOURTH SESSION.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TORONTO, March 5.

After recess,

PRIVATE BILLS.

The following Private Bills were passed through Committee:—

Mr. Morris—Respecting the re-consolidation and future limitation of the debenture debt of the city of Toronto, and for other purposes.

Mr. Paxton—To incorporate the Snowdon Branch Railway.

Mr. Paxton—To incorporate the Lake Scugog Marsh Lands Draining Co.

Mr. Williams—To further amend the Act incorporating the Hamilton Gaslight Co.

VILLAGE OF NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. CURRIE moved the second reading of the Bill relating to the village of Niagara Falls. Carried.

OTTAWA STREET RAILWAY.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE moved the second reading of the Act respecting the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company.

Mr. BETHUNE said that the Railway Committee had passed the Bill upon the understanding that the Railway Company were bound to maintain that portion of the street lying between the tracks, but he had found that a judgment had been delivered deciding that such was not the case. The only duties in regard to the track that devolved upon the Company was to put it down, and having once laid it, they were not legally bound to maintain it in good repair. He was informed that the contract had been entered into by the City Council advisedly, and with a full knowledge of the facts. He understood that the effect of casting upon the Company the burden of maintaining the street between the tracks and the grading adjacent would be to confiscate the railway, as the Company was not in a very flourishing condition. If the House passed a Bill of that kind it would be an act of spoliation, and he called upon the Government not to allow a bargain that had been wittingly entered into to be set aside in the interests of one of the parties. He moved that the Bill be read this day six months.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE said that the member for Ottawa who had allowed the Bill incorporating the Street Railway Company to pass this House had been a Director of the Company, and the citizens had been cheated out of their rights without their knowledge. The decision of Judge Wilson, which his hon. friend had referred to, had been qualified by the statement that had the suit been brought by the city instead of by a private individual he might not have given the decision he had. The expectations of the people in regard to the nature of the rails, &c., had not been carried out, and they now asked the House to put the matter right.

Mr. DEACON was opposed to the Bill because the principle involved was one that he did not think should be recognized.

The hour for the consideration of Private Bills having expired, the matter was dropped, Mr. Deacon having the floor.

CONCURRENCE.

The consideration of the report of the Committee of Supply was then proceeded with.

Mr. CURRIE resumed his speech on the amendments proposed by the hon. members for London and North Renfrew. From what he knew of the feeling of the country he believed that a decrease in Ministers' salaries would not be a popular measure. A cast iron rule was sought to be laid down, which would have the effect of reducing the salaries of efficient and inefficient officers alike. He thought the better way would be for the Opposition to challenge the salaries of those officials only who were not worthy of the amounts they were receiving. The amendment included a reduction of \$500 in the salary of the Inspector of Prisons, a very capable gentleman, and an officer who had the control of an expenditure of about \$500,000 a year. He pointed out the injustice of the course proposed, in that no account was proposed to be taken of the ability, length of service, or any other circumstance which ought to be considered in the fixing of an official's salary. If his hon. friend from London were to cross the floor of the House after the next election he was sure that the country would not grudge him the salary which he refused to allow the hon. leader of the Government. The doctrine of the Opposition was that the salaries of Ministers should fluctuate with the price of potatoes and pork; if pork went down, the salaries of the members of the Government should go down, and if potatoes went up, Governmental salaries should likewise go up. (Laughter.) He deprecated the attack that had been made upon the legal profession. Some of the men who had rendered the most distinguished services to the country had been lawyers, and he thought it would be an evil day when the memory of Baldwin, Hagerman, and others ceased to be held green. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. DEACON said that if the Opposition in advocating a reduction in the Ministers' salaries were doing that which would be so much to the benefit of the Government, the amendments should be allowed to pass. He defended himself against the charge of inconsistency in voting for a reduction in the salary of Mr. Scott. He had in 1873 voted against the reduction of the salary to \$800, but had voted to reduce it by the sum of \$200. If money were worth so much more now than then, where was the inconsistency in voting to reduce it by \$300? He had then voted for reductions in other salaries, including that of the Inspector of Prisons, and had been accompanied by the vote of the Hon. Commissioner of Public Works and other hon. members who would doubtless vote against the amendments that had been proposed. At the time that the salaries of Ministers were increased it was the understanding that they should devote their whole time to their duties. But they had not done so, although the Hon. the Provincial Secretary had once made a characteristic attack upon an official in the employ of the Dominion Government for writing public letters and charging a fee for them for his own benefit. The Opposition proposed to make a reduction in the official salaries in the public interest, and if the country

did not sustain them, so much the better for the Government. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. HARDY thought that if the hon. member for North Renfrew had been able to carry out his parallel there might have been some force in his remarks. But he had failed to show that he (Mr. Hardy) had employed the public time and put a private fee in his own pocket. He pointed out that though the Opposition had opened the session with a good many promises, their professions of economy had dwindled down to a paltry motion to reduce the salaries of civil officials. After all their caucusing during the session, they now proposed to go, hat in hand, to the old members of the civil service, who had grown grey in serving the public, begging each to contribute his mite towards the maintenance of the rich Province of Ontario. (Hear, hear.) For seven years they had sat quietly and allowed the great majority of the salaries to be voted unchallenged, and now upon the eve of the elections they came forward with a paltry resolution to take a few hundred dollars apiece from the income of those who had served the public long and well; and where was the bold policy that had been announced at the beginning of the session? Had the proposal to distribute the surplus and other large schemes come down to a miserable policy of deducting \$16,000 from salaries? If such were the case, as it seemed to be, he ventured to think that the country would easily see through the transparent device. (Cheers.)

The amendment to the amendment was then put, and lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Calvin, Code, Coutts, Creighton, Deacon, Flesher, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, McDougall, McGowan, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Morris, Mostyn, O'Sullivan, Parkhill, Preston, Richardson, Rosevear, Scott, Tooley, White, Wigle—31.

NAYS.—Messrs. Ballantyne, Baxter, Bethune, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Grant, Harcourt, Hardy, Hargraff, Hay, Lane, Lyon (Algoma), Lyon (Halton), McCraney, McLaws, McLeod, McMahon, Massie, Master, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Robinson, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson, Wood—47.

The result was received with cheers.

Mr. MEREDITH moved that the said resolution be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the Committee of Supply with instructions to reduce the item of the salary of the Attorney-General from the sum of \$5,000 to the sum of \$4,500.

Mr. PARDEE raised a point of order. He thought that the proposal had been defeated in the previous motion.

Mr. SPEAKER decided that it was in order.

The motion was put and lost, on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Calvin, Code, Coutts, Creighton, Deacon, Flesher, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, McDougall, McGowan, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Morris, Mostyn, O'Sullivan, Parkhill, Preston, Richardson, Rosevear, Scott, Tooley, White, Wigle—30.

NAYS.—Messrs. Ballantyne, Baxter, Bethune, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Grange, Grant, Harcourt, Hardy, Hargraff, Hay, Lane, Lyon (Algoma), Lyon (Halton), McCraney, McLaws, McLeod, McMahon, Massie, Master, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Robinson, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson—47.

Mr. MEREDITH moved that the said resolution be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the Committee of Supply with instructions to reduce all the salaries under this head which are in excess of \$800 by ten per cent. of the amount, but not so as to reduce any such salary to an amount below \$800.

The motion was lost on the same division as the previous one.

Mr. Deacon's amendment was put and lost on the same division, and the original motion was put and carried by a vote of 31 to 47.

Mr. WOOD moved that the item \$16,100, to defray the expenses of the Treasurer's office be now concurred in.

Mr. MEREDITH moved that the sum be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the Committee of Supply with instructions to reduce the salary of the Treasurer by the sum of \$500.

The motion was lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Calvin, Code, Coutts, Creighton, Deacon, Flesher, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, McDougall, McGowan, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Morris, Mostyn, O'Sullivan, Parkhill, Preston, Richardson, Rosevear, Scott, Tooley, White, Wigle—30.

NAYS.—Ballantyne, Baxter, Bethune, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Grange, Grant, Harcourt, Hardy, Hargraff, Hay, Lane, Lyon (Algoma), Lyon (Halton), McCraney, McLaws, McLeod, McMahon, Massie, Master, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Robinson, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson—47.

Mr. MEREDITH moved a similar resolution to the one which he had moved with regard to the salaries in the Attorney-General's office, which was lost on the same division.

Mr. WOOD moved that the item \$25,995, to defray the expenses of the Secretary and Registrar's office, be now concurred in.

Mr. MEREDITH moved that the said resolution be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the Committee of Supply with instructions to reduce the salary of the Secretary and Registrar by the sum of \$500.

The motion was put and lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Calvin, Code, Coutts, Creighton, Deacon, Flesher, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, McDougall, McGowan, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Morris, Mostyn, O'Sullivan, Parkhill, Preston, Richardson, Rosevear, Scott, Tooley, White, Wigle, Wills—32.

NAYS.—Messrs. Appleby, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bethune, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Gra-