

deal with the people who sent us here to represent them. That is what I have to say in connection with this matter. I did go to my constituents in connection with it. I gave them my views of it. Substantially I told them what I have told the House here to-night, and I found that my constituents disapproved of the proposition; and I could not see my way, in view of that, to take the money for my own use. I do not intend hereafter to take that money for my own use, I think the people of this country do not approve of our taking it. When we put the measure through we did it in defiance of an understanding with the people that we were satisfied with the indemnity as it then was, and that if we saw fit to increase it, we should have provided that the law should go into force only after this parliament ceased to exist. So I trust that after all the expressions of public opinion that have taken place, and all the fencing that has been made on this question, hon. gentlemen will have the courage to repeal that law and to square themselves with the people who sent them here to represent them.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything on this question; but, in view of the somewhat extraordinary position taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who has just taken his seat, I think it is due to myself as a member of this House to say a word or two. I want to say distinctly that the hon. gentleman himself is the best judge of whether he has been besmirched or not; but for my part, I was in my place when these votes were taken, and I do not believe that I have been besmirched or that my honour or my duty to my constituents has been injured in any degree. As regards one proposition, discussed at that time, in common probably with many other members of the House, I did not feel that I was in a position at the moment to discuss it—that is, the question of the retiring allowances to ministers. My reason for not discussing that question at that time was that I had just returned from New Brunswick, I think on the day the question was introduced, and it came to me as an entirely new question.

I knew there was a policy existing in Britain with regard to the matter; and without having had an opportunity of consulting the authorities as to just what the law in Britain was, I did not feel myself justified in then entering upon a discussion of the question. I realized—what some hon. members do not always perhaps so fully realize—that the affairs of the country could go on for another year or another session even though I did not speak on the question. I intended then, if it turned as I anticipated it would, that a system which better commended itself to my judgment existed in Britain than the system introduced on that occasion, to take the oppor-

tunity when I could of ventilating my views to this House. I am not satisfied with the manner in which we settled the question of the retiring allowance to ministers and I am glad to find we will have an opportunity of discussing and reconsidering it. But I want to take no doubtful, vacillating position on the question of indemnity. I want to say to this House that, in my opinion, a member of the House of Commons who, taking the average of long sessions and short sessions—and there is no reason that we should not have some short sessions, and there is no avoiding very many long sessions—I say that a member of the House of Commons who attends to his duties to the best of his ability and is capable of attending to them—and his constituents are the best judges of that—who is here from day to day attending to the affairs of the country, is well worth \$2,500. And whenever my constituents think I am not worth that, I am ready to retire from public life. In the county of Simcoe from which I come, I have no mortgage on the people and they are under no necessity to send me here. If they do not think I earn my \$2,500, they will have no difficulty in finding men in every concession worth that indemnity, and they are at perfect liberty to send such men here and I shall retire to a position more suitable perhaps to me than the one I occupy. But whatever way this comes up—I care not whether by round robin or square robin or any other way I knew of nothing dishonourable in the conduct of members of this House on either side with regard to this matter, and I would have been glad, had it been opportune, to have spoken on this question of indemnity and justified my views. But if I was silent, I understood that I was the one to take that money and use it for my own purposes. If I did not think I was justified in taking it for my own purposes, I would not consider I was justified in taking it for any other purpose. I intend to take and enjoy it as far as I can, so long as it is the law of the land; and I have no hesitation in enunciating my views and making my position known in so far as it is in the public interest that it should be known. I have not gone down hat in hand in my riding to my constituents, it is true, but I shall go to them when they want me and when the occasion arises, and I shall not go to them feeling that I have been less fairly their representative in the last session than in the previous sessions. I am sorry to have to differ to some extent from my hon. friend who has just spoken. (Mr. W. F. Maclean); I know, he is an old member of this House. Besmirched! I know that he commands a very powerful organ and that it is dangerous for me to speak even in this mild way in opposition, to him. But this is a free country, and I believe the decision last session was in the main the honest expression of the people's representatives; and taking that view I am