

the Welland Canal and she was damaged owing to the fault of the Government in not keeping the canal in proper repair. The amount the Government paid me was what I proved to be my loss before the arbitrators, and they kept me out of the money eight years and then did not pay me any interest. There were only eighteen Grits who voted against that grant, and they were the extreme wing of the party, for everyone knew that I had suffered and all through no fault of my own. This is the scandal of which I am said to be guilty, and I cannot rise in this House and speak on a question of importance to the commerce of the country without being told that I am unfortunate, if so, there are many unfortunate men. I am not the first man who has got damages from the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. We will take it all back and say that the hon. gentleman has been fortunate.

Mr. McCALLUM. That may be your opinion. I have not made any complaint against you, but I am here as an independent member of Parliament and I am ready to meet any charges. If any hon. member has anything to say against me or against my course in Parliament or any insinuations to make, out with them, for I am ready to meet one and all.

Mr. FOSTER. With respect to what the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) spoke of, I have noticed the same paragraph in the paper as that which he read. I do not think it is the law yet. I think they have had a provision making residence necessary. That is also necessary for masters and mates who take charge of our boats, they must have been domiciled for a number of years in Canada before they can obtain certificates as masters and mates of our vessels. With respect to engineers, I do not think it is so. However, when that legislation becomes perfect, if it should become the law of the United States, the Government can look into the matter with respect to our engineers.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure it will be gratifying to the colleagues of the Minister of Public Works to know that the constituency of Verchères in Quebec has been carried by the Liberals by a very large majority.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate \$57,388 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is something contrary to all precedent. The Senate are cutting down expenses, and I would like to know the reason. How is it that they are able to get along with only \$57,000 as against \$61,000 the year before?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. "While the lamp holds out to burn, &c."

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose the hon. gentleman has not forgotten the fact that the Session last year was about double the usual length.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think any of us will forget that fact for the term of our natural lives. Is that the only reason for decrease?

Mr. SPEAKER. The details show that the vote last year was only \$57,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that, but I see there is no apparent explanation of it.

Salaries, House of Commons per Clerk's estimates \$84,075 00

Mr. SPEAKER. This item shows an increase of \$725, which is accounted for in this way: There are thirty clerks who are receiving an increase of \$50 per year, in accordance with the report of the Internal Economy Commissioners, laid on the Table last year. That makes \$1,500. That report provided for a new junior clerk who has been appointed at \$400, making an increase of \$1,900, but there has been a saving in the salary of Mr. Poetter, whose death has occurred since last Session. This makes a net increase of \$725, but owing to some changes which have taken place since that time, next year there will be really no increase, although we are giving these statutory increases of \$50.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there are thirty-seven sessional messengers at \$250 a Session. A certain number of messengers are, no doubt, necessary, but I hardly think there is a necessity for thirty-seven. I do not know how many there were engaged in the past, but I have noticed that there are more than are really necessary. I cannot see that there is work for so many men at \$250 a Session.

House of Commons—Contingencies \$24,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Last year, although we had a very long Session, we did not seem to require the whole of this amount. Only \$19,000 were charged to contingencies. Was that sufficient?

Mr. SPEAKER. The whole of the \$12,000 is required for stationery. The stationery is increasing very largely every year, as the hon. gentleman must know from the quantity sent out to the country, and it is with great difficulty that the clerk of stationery is able to keep down the estimates. He has only done it by giving us a cheaper kind of stationery. He has made a great saving by lowering the quality of the envelopes. Hon. members now use a great number of envelopes instead of wrappers in sending out their speeches and papers, as they think that ensures their being sent with greater expedition, and they, of course, cost more than common wrapping paper. The other items are the same. We may have only spent \$9,000 last year, but the saving has been in unforeseen and unprovided expenses, the amount of which we cannot estimate exactly in advance, and we try to save as much as possible in them.

Mr. VAIL. Do the boxes of stationery come out of that amount?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, out of the \$12,000.

Mr. VAIL. I observe in the Auditor-General's report that while the trunks of the House of Commons cost only \$3, those of the Senate cost \$4.50. Are they not made by the same party?

Mr. SPEAKER. We buy very closely; I suppose we are more economical.

Publishing Debates, House of Commons \$40,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much did this service cost us last year?

Mr. SPEAKER. About \$70,000, owing to the long Session.

Salaries and contingencies, per Sergeant-at-Arms estimate \$30,842 50

Mr. SPEAKER. That shows a decrease of \$10, which arises from putting the report of the Commissioners of Internal Economy into operation, and is owing to a change in the messengers. While the other messengers got the statutory increase, the new messenger was given the lower salary.