

respond with those of the other Chamber. Such a question as this ought not to be made one of the little party questions to give a slap in the face to the Speaker of House or any of its hon. members. All that he would ask from the House was that they would consider the matter carefully, and in the same way that they had considered it in 1873, and not to try and make out that the Committee had passed the limits assigned to it. Let them have the same fair play which had been accorded to the former Government. They asked no more. If the hon. gentleman was willing to give them the same fair play they were all right. They were in a better position, for they had created no new offices, but only filled vacancies and re-adjusted the salaries. He knew that a small stir had been made about it, but he believed that when it was seen that powers had been given to the Committee to revise the salaries, it would also be seen that they had acted according to the rules of the House, and he would move that the report be referred to the Committee on Contingencies.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Is the hon. gentleman going to move now?

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—Not now.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL was surprised at the manner in which the question had been brought before the House. There was not the slightest disposition on his part to attack the Government or anybody else, but a day or two after the meeting of the House a motion was made for the appointment of the Committee on Contingencies, and his friend behind him rather declined to join, as he alleged that something had been done during recess, of which he did not approve. He did not wish to make any attack upon any member of the Government, but he maintained, and proposed to maintain, the full power and right of this House to overlook the appointments of the House, and he would do his best to prevent the Government from assuming that power. He would affirm that right and deny that power most distinctly. He made no attack on the Government, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture made a most unnecessary attack upon him, and had contrasted his conduct in committee three

years ago with his own. He (Mr. Campbell) made no such contrast, but for the purpose of making an attack upon him, the Minister of Agriculture said that the report under consideration made much less change in the establishment of the House than the one he (Mr. Campbell) had made, and that he (Mr. Campbell) had changed three offices and created three new officers. But the hon. gentleman was utterly mistaken, and he was surprised that he had fallen into such an error. From the desire of making an attack upon him, it seemed that he had not paid that attention to details which he ought to have done before making the attack. The hon. gentleman had accused him (Mr. Campbell) of creating new offices, meaning thereby that the titles of second English clerk, third English clerk, and shorthand writer were new. But they appointed none to office. The second English clerk was appointed by this House in 1868, while they were speaking of 1873. Mr. John George Bourinot, the son of his friend, the loss of whose services to the House he could not but regret, was appointed in 1869 as third English clerk and shorthand writer. Messrs. Le Moine and Miller were also appointed about the same time. All that he and his colleagues had done was to give them new titles, and he would ask the House whether this was not a part of the duty assigned to them. They found these gentlemen in office, and as it was part of their duty to distribute the labours of the House, they gave these gentlemen certain labours to perform. All that they did was to arrange their duties and change the name of their office. In the present case, however, three new officers had been appointed, and in making these appointments they had entirely gone beyond the scope contained in the plan contained in the resolution passed last session, which was simply to provide for the readjustment of salaries, but gave no authority whatever to appoint two new officers and one new servant to the House. No such power had been entrusted to the Committee. He would have said nothing about it, however, if the Hon. Minister of Agriculture had not thus stepped out of his way to make an attack upon him. Had the hon. gentleman obtained right in-