

such a late hour to-night. It is evident that there are a large number of members, particularly from the great Northwest, who desire to wash their dirty linen and to discuss the question of which no doubt they are full and which it is probably their duty to discuss. Then there are other bills which we will have an opportunity to discuss. No doubt many of these members came here desiring to place before the House their views in connection with the tariff question, and they will be shut off. Then again there is the insurance question which was to have come up. It is very well on occasions like this to bring up the views of hon. gentlemen on subjects of this kind in order that they may be fully considered and that the Government might have the advantage of the views of the members of the House on these questions.

Another burning question not only in this House but in this country, on which no doubt a number of members desire to express themselves, is the question of the increased indemnity to members and the pension to ex-ministers or what might be called, what has been called throughout the country, the salary grab. It was not my intention to discuss that here to-night, but the fact that the county of Dufferin, which I have the honour to represent in different meetings in their conventions both Reform and Conservative, condemned the Bill, places me in the position that I would feel bound either to resign or to emphasize the position which that is in at the present time.

That is the position I occupy, and I stated at a convention that was held a short time before I left home that I would oppose the increased indemnity. I also said that when the opportunity presented itself I would avail myself of it to have the legislation of last session revised, but as the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) has declared he will do so I may possibly leave it to his hands. I believe that we as servants of the people have the right to change our vote if necessary in order to meet the views of our constituents, or otherwise that we should cease to represent them. I believe that everything that is done should be done in the light of day, and I believe that the round-robin (which I did not sign) was the commencement of the agitation for an increase and it was all wrong. We have been told that committees were formed to find out the feeling in the different provinces, but about this I know nothing. I never signed to support any increase and I would not have done so were I asked. But I am free to admit that I was present in the House when the subject was discussed; it was only discussed on one or two days, it was hurried through the House in such a way that members could not have ascertained whether or not they were acting according to the wishes of their constituents. The increase of the indemnity by \$1,000 was in my opinion un-

necessary. We were elected knowing that the indemnity was \$1,500. I believe that remuneration is intended, not as a salary but as an indemnity, merely enough to pay our expenses while we are here, and I do think that with a little economy there is no member of this House who cannot get through a session of four or five months or even six months, with \$1,500. Under these circumstances I believe that the increase granted in the dying hours of the session when members of the House were anxious to return to their homes and did not look into it as they otherwise would do, was not what should have been done. At every election held in the province of Ontario since, the candidates have vied one with the other in declaring that it was a monstrous thing to do, and that if they were returned to this House they would repeal that legislation. We have not heard an expression of opinion from them so far, but no doubt they are prepared to carry out their pledges to the electors. And if the increased indemnity to the members was bad, the pensions to the ex-ministers was very much worse. I venture to say that the great majority of the members of this House did not understand the pension system to ex-ministers in the motherland. We are likely to some extent to copy from the legislation of the mother country, and it was said by several hon. gentlemen that the pension system as it was introduced here was similar to that in England. We had not time to examine into that, but we find now that the system is altogether different from that proposed here. In England, only ex-ministers who state they are unable to support themselves receive pensions, but here, young men, men who have grown wealthy at the public crib are to receive a pension, and it is extraordinary how some of the ex-ministers have grown wealthy in a very few years, have become millionaires if not multi-millionaires. And yet these men are to receive a pension, apparently as a reward for the way in which they have gained that wealth, and which in my opinion cannot have been too honestly acquired. Under these circumstances, I believe that the law is wrong, and that if it be necessary at all we should have it on the same basis as the English law in that respect. Five years is much too short for a minister to step out and receive a pension. As the years roll on these pensions may multiply until the aggregate sum becomes a burden on this country greater than the country is prepared to bear. We have had growing times it is true, but we cannot afford to pile up for future generations expenses of that kind. Under the laws that exist now, whether a minister of the Crown has been a success in his office or not, he may say: Just leave me in five years and I will give way to some one else. Thus the pensions may pile up until we have an army of ex-ministers throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, entailing an expense greater than this country is prepared