

expected to vote except against the people who were continually vilifying them, continually declaring that they were not entitled to their rights as citizens of the country? The hon. gentleman suggests that a racial and religious question was projected into that campaign by a memorandum issued by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the tendency of which was to secure a solid Roman Catholic vote. Those of us who had the fortune, good or bad, to listen to the speeches that were made during the election in Saskatchewan will agree that a Roman Catholic would be less than a man or more than an angel to vote in support of the men and the party who were abusing him and his church as they were being abused there.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to say that such an attack was never made in my hearing and I was on a great many platforms.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, a great deal went on that my hon. friend did not hear or did not see. I wish to point out the necessary consequence of the wild and unjustifiable statements that have been made and of the attitude that has been assumed by our friends on the other side during this discussion for the simple and sole and only purpose of making party political capital when the circumstances do not justify its being made. My friend from Qu'Appelle, (Mr. Lake), has stated deliberately, has put upon 'Hansard,' upon the permanent records of this country, a declaration that the settlers of this country are subjected to terrorism on the part of the officials of this government. That charge is absolutely unfounded, and I say further that that charge would not have been made if the gentleman who made it had properly considered its necessary effect, and provided he was inspired by patriotic motives. The attempt to divide the people of that western country as between Protestant and Catholic, as between non-English speaking and English speaking, is an attempt that can do no other than harm to that country and to this, and can do no other than reflect discredit upon those who make that attempt.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox and Addington). Mr. Speaker, I wish merely to refer to what is known as the salary grab. It is well known in this House by everybody who talked to me on the subject that I opposed that. It is well known that for years I opposed the increase of the judges' salaries, and I was opposed to the increase in indemnity. When it was raised \$500 from \$1,000 to \$1,500, we had the promise of the Prime Minister that it would be a great many years before any other increase would take place, and I am a good deal more opposed to the superannuation or the pension to ex-ministers. I had occasion to go home on Saturday, and this vote took place on Monday. I took the pains to go into the

Mr. OLIVER.

distribution office and get a copy of the Votes, and Proceedings and the Orders of the Day, and no mention of any kind was made of this at that time. Now, I am told that this notice was handed in on Sunday night, and appeared on the Order Paper on Monday morning. If that is the case I think some minister is responsible for it and ought to make an explanation to the House as Rule 31 requires two days' notice before it could have been brought up in the House, because I expected to be here when these resolutions were brought up and I expected to say something upon it, because I knew very well then as I do now, that my constituents, irrespective of their party politics, are strongly opposed to the three things, the increased salary to judges, the pension to the ex-ministers and the increase in the indemnity to members of the House of Commons and the Senate. I have heard very little or no complaint about the increase to the Prime Minister or the salary granted to the leader of the opposition. I think people generally look upon these things as being all right, but I wish to place myself on record as being strongly opposed to the other part of these resolutions and I hope before many days we will have an opportunity of dividing the House upon these three questions, or on two of them at any rate, because I think that if the government had wanted to deal fairly with this question they would have put it on the Order paper and let it stay there for two or three weeks, so as to let it be discussed through the newspapers. Or we should have told the people when we went before them for election that we were in favour of an increase in the indemnity of members of the Commons and Senators, pensions to ex-ministers, and increased salaries to judges. I am quite satisfied that if any gentleman appeals to my constituency on these terms he will be left at home, and I think justly. We are a rural district, we earn our money hard, the bulk of the people earn their money hard and they feel that this is being just a little too extravagant and that is my opinion and that is what I intend to stand for. I hope that this matter will be further discussed at an early date. It is very late to-night and I do not propose to say anything but just to put myself on record as against this.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin). I think it is rather to be regretted that it is the intention to close this debate at this late hour for it is quite evident that there are two questions foremost before this House which hon. members desire to discuss and so far as we know, having been told to-day that there is very little before the House, we certainly must remain here for a length of time even to earn the indemnity if the increase was taken off. Under these circumstances it seems to me we are beginning wrong by carrying on this debate to