

of communicating with Mr. Osler, counsel for the Crown, who lives in Toronto.

IMPERIAL TITLES.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to make an inquiry of the Government in reference to a matter that has been somewhat discussed in the country, that is, the conferring of Imperial titles on Canadian subjects. Are the titles conferred on the recommendation of the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of His Excellency, or by what authority? I would like to know for my own information, and I know there are many people throughout the country who would also like to have some information on the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. Government orders.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to have a reply to my question. I think it is a question which may be asked, and on which we should have information. If it is done by the will of the Imperial Government, we would like to know it; if it is done by representations from the Government here, we would like to know it.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the hon. gentleman put his question on the paper. It is a very unusual one; I think there is no precedent for having it asked in the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, we will create a precedent.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. RIDER. Mr. Speaker, when I had the privilege and honour of moving the adjournment of the debate on Wednesday last, I was proceeding to give you evidence to show that there was no necessity for levying fresh burdens on the people of this country with the object of meeting the difficulties now before us. In order to satisfy myself upon this point, I have been looking over the Auditor General's accounts to see where in economies might be made to relieve the people from such burdens, and I have prepared a list of the departmental employees and the salaries paid in 1878 as compared with 1894. You well know, Sir, that the Mackenzie Administration was accused of being very extravagant in the employment of civil service employees and in other ways, and that there was no necessity for so great an expenditure to be kept up. The statement I have prepared which shows an unnecessary and extravagant increase in

the annual departmental expenditure is as follows:—

Salary paid.	Number in 1878.	Number in 1894.	Increase in Number	Increase in Salaries.
\$				\$
1,000	15	144	129	129,000
1,100	9	35	26	28,600
1,200	21	45	24	27,600
1,300	28	35	7	9,100
1,400	28	130	102	142,800
1,500	8	34	26	34,000
1,700	4	18	14	23,800
1,800	8	55	47	84,600
1,900	3	8	5	9,500
2,000	6	28	22	44,000
2,300	1	5	4	13,800
2,400	10	27	17	40,800
2,500	4	4	10,000
2,600	6	6	15,600
2,800	5	5	14,000
3,000	2	4	2	6,000
3,200	11	19	8	25,600
3,400	3	3	10,200
4,200	1	1	4,200
5,000	3	3	15,000
6,000	1	1	6,000
Totals ..	154	610	456	694,200

Making the number employed in 1878, receiving \$1,000 and over, 154, being an increase in the number of 466, and an annual increase in salary of \$694,200. It would seem, in view of this fact, and other expenses, when we compare the two Administrations, that there would be no necessity for resorting to increased or new taxation for the purpose of meeting the financial difficulties which we have to face at present. I find, also, in comparing the travelling expenses of Ministers and officials, under the two regimes that the difference is even greater. One of the faults charged by hon. gentlemen opposite against the Mackenzie Administration was the amount of these travelling expenses; and, therefore, it is but proper that the people who have not the opportunity of looking over the Auditor General's accounts, should have put before them the facts in as clear and precise a manner as possible. I find that the travelling expenses of Ministers and officials, including cab-hire, in 1878-79 amounted to \$6,241.50. The travelling expenses of Ministers and officials, including street car fare and cab-hire, in 1893-94, amounted to \$23,629.41; or there was over five times as much expended in 1894 as in 1878. Surely no one can pretend that this is not a controllable expenditure, entirely under the control of the Government. I find, also, that, notwithstanding the fact that there are at least ten lawyers in the present Govern-