

in order to have that accomplished. My hon. friend the Secretary of State, the custodian of the honour and dignity of this House, acquiesced in the suspension of the rules although personally I know in the committee, although I cannot speak of what took place in there, he did not altogether approve of it. That Bill was passed by a majority on the third reading in the manner I have indicated to the House. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen whether a deliberative body like this, which is supposed to be constituted for the purpose of revising and correcting the legislation coming from the other House, is worthy of that character, when Bills are rushed through in that way? I have spoken plainly on this case. I feel strongly upon it. It lowers the dignity of the Senate to such a degree that I have come to the conclusion that the press of the country was justified in denouncing the manner in which business has been done in the Senate. One day three or four other Bills of a most important character, increasing the salaries to judges, increasing the sessional indemnity, and what is called the Pension Bill all came to us in a hurry. My hon. friend the Secretary of State moved a suspension of all the rules so that they went through in a gallop. I was called out five minutes to speak to a gentleman at the end of the Chamber. On my return I asked what had become of such and such Bills. The hon. gentleman to whom I spoke said that they had passed through the three readings in my absence. That was the way legislation was pushed through the House last session, but not to such an extent as in previous sessions. I appeal to the common sense of this House, —probably this is the last time I shall ever speak from the position I now occupy—to consider this matter, and if they wish to maintain their own respect and the honour of the House of which they are members, put a stop to that practice in future.

Had proper consideration been given those Bills, do hon. gentlemen suppose that half the difficulty which has arisen in discussing these three questions to which I have called your attention, by the press and even among ministers would have occurred —because we find they did not agree. We find Mr. Fielding and Mr. Paterson at London, at one of those by-elections, addressing

Hon Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

the people defended the legislation. We find the new Postmaster general and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman), telling different stories altogether, and we find even the premier intimating his intention to make certain changes. I do not know that anything has been discussed to a greater extent, and without knowledge of what they were talking about, than the measure, increasing the members indemnity. Have any hon. gentlemen looked at that question? On analyzing the figures I find that under the provisions of the new law, with its restrictions, as interpreted, the cost to the country will not be as great as under the old law. I shall give an illustration of what I mean. I have been looking into this question to a considerable extent, and I take this opportunity to lay before the Senators and the public the result, in order to prove that the newspapers and the members of parliament and others who have been discussing this question, were ignorant of the subject with which they were dealing. I have taken instances of ten senators—I shall not give their names, because whatever these gentlemen received was what the law gave them, but in laying this statement before the Senate I want to point out this fact, that the gentlemen who drew these large amounts for a few days attendance were strictly within the law as it then existed.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—That is not conceded. I was always of the very opposite opinion.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—It is a minority opinion.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—There are some portions of the opinion which I do not agree with myself. The old law made this provision, that if you came the first day of the session you were entitled to the full indemnity of \$1,500, less the number of days that you were absent from the sittings of the House. You had included in the attendance all the holidays that took place. There is no question about that. You also had included fifteen days of non-attendance.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—No.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Yes, under the old law.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—I do not admit it.