

worth more than \$6,000 a year, but I do not think that any one will undertake to contend that the services of a majority of the members are worth more than that. The rate of \$6,000 a year is very handsome payment indeed. The members should have been satisfied with it, and should not have introduced such a measure as this. I was sorry that the leader of the Government did not speak in a more decided tone when he came to express the hope that this would not form a precedent. As I said before, I think it is highly objectionable and discreditable legislation. It just means this, that the House of Commons have the public Treasury under their control, and at the close of the shortest session for 18 years they help themselves from the Treasury to the extent of about \$8,000. They are supposed to be the guardians of the Treasury and yet, while acting as guardians, they are taking the public funds for the benefit of members of Parliament, to the extent of about \$8,000.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time at length at the Table.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL moved the third reading of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—Divide!

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I regret very much the innovation which has been under discussion, but I think we would be taking a very high-handed part if we were to throw out this Bill. I have no personal interest in it, but I should be very sorry to interfere with the opinions and views of gentlemen whose position and circumstances I do not choose at the present moment to inquire about. I think it is a great mistake to discuss this Bill, and it would be a still greater mistake to divide the House upon it. If there is to be a division I ask to be excused from voting.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—The reason why I ask for the yeas and nays is this—a few days ago, a recommendation was made by the Contingent Accounts Committee of this House to give our sessional messengers the full sessional allowance. This was objected to by the Government. It was one of the smallest and most penurious things that I knew any Government to be guilty of. I venture to say that if the late Sir John Macdonald had been in his place in the

other House, or the late Mr. Mackenzie, he would have shrunk from doing an injustice to those poor helpless sessional messengers. I understand the Internal Economy Committee of the other House have graciously agreed to allow them fifteen out of the thirty-five days that they were short of the 100, thereby diminishing the reduction to \$40 or \$50 each. It is a small thing to make any reduction in the pay of those men, and I am astonished that any Government or committee would be guilty of it. A Bill is now presented to this House asking that members of both Houses of Parliament should be granted \$48 each—for what? Is it for attending to their duties in Parliament? No, it is simply to pay them for looking after their own private business at home, or, I will not say gallivanting about the country, but going about the country interfering in elections. Last year it was very objectionable to grant additional indemnity—this year I consider it still more objectionable, for the reasons which have been given by the hon. gentleman from Halifax. This is one of the shortest sessions since Confederation, and we would be doing wrong if we were to vote away some \$8,000, which this Bill will be the means of doing, while we are depriving the six sessional messengers in this House of some \$40 or \$50 each. If those messengers had any control over the length of the session, if it were through any fault of their own that they are here a shorter time than usual it would be different. The fact that this session covers only sixty or sixty-five days is not their fault. If they were in a position to vindicate their rights I would not occupy the time of the House in discussing the subject, but certainly I do not feel disposed to let this Bill go without dividing the House.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN—I think we are making a great ado about a small matter. Moreover, I do not think we have a right to criticize the proceedings of the other House and suggest that they are taking this extra amount to cover time spent in looking after elections. It is a pity the matter should be discussed in this way. As regards the messengers, I was one of those who voted in the Committee for not granting them an extra allowance, and for this reason, the hon. gentleman knows very well that we have had it thrown in our teeth from time to time that our expenditures are extravagant,