

with, for other reasons besides the mere conduct of these departments—as, for instance, our Law Clerk is secretary of two or three committees, and does a considerable deal of work apart from that. So it is with the accountants; we have not a separate accountant, as there is in the House of Commons.

HON. MR. MILLER—There are two accountants in the House of Commons.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Every word of the report indicates perfect impartiality as respects the two Houses, and shows that there is no desire whatever to encroach on the privileges of the Senate. With regard to the stationery, the amount is fixed for the House of Commons as well as for the Senate, and it is fixed at a rate which is somewhat less, in proportion, for the House of Commons than for the Senate.

HON. MR. POWER—No.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Ours is fixed at \$4,000 and the House of Commons at \$10,000—that is a fraction more than for us, in proportion to our numbers; so I do not think there is any reason for supposing that there is any desire to encroach on our privileges. As my hon. friend suggests, I will see between now and the afternoon if the report can be made more satisfactory. I move that the consideration of the report be postponed until the next sitting of this House.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the general subject connected with the report, but simply to correct some observations which have fallen from the leader of the Government. He says that this cannot be regarded as dictation from the Government. This committee originated with the Government.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—It originated with this House.

HON. MR. SCOTT—This investigation originated with the Government. On this committee it was a question simply what the Government desired. As my hon. friend from Richmond has observed, it is very well known that year by year the privileges of this House are diminishing, that the importance and the voice of this

Chamber have been year by year growing less and less, and it is perfectly evident that the Senate had simply to submit to the dictation of that committee.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I absolutely and positively deny what the hon. gentleman says. I was present at every meeting of the committee but one, and I say there never was a pretence of dictation by any member of the House of Commons or by any member of the Government. A good many suggestions came from members of the Senate, and the inquiry was conducted with the utmost possible fairness on both sides.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman knows very well that in the showing that came before that committee it was utterly impossible for the members of the Government, who were on that committee, to charge the smallest amount of extravagance in connection with the several officers of the Senate.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I said so.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It was proposed originally that there should be but one post office. It was shown that that would increase the expense—that we have but one official, whereas if the post offices were amalgamated there would be two. So with the proposition to have but one reading room. Was that proposition made from the Senate? No. It was shown that there would be no saving there either. It was made apparent, also, that some 120 of the papers taken in the Senate are afterwards transferred to the Library. The papers of the House of Commons are so cut up and scissored by members that they cannot be bound. Ours are bound at the end of the year, and therefore our expenditure on the reading room ought to be diminished by that amount. Then, in reference to the Law Clerk's branch: while they have several officials in that branch of the House of Commons we have but one, and it must be apparent to everybody that no saving could be effected there, apart from the question of having a second revising officer. When you come to trench on other matters, more particularly governed by the contingencies of the Senate, I say that the economies practised by our committee

HON. MR. ABBOTT.