

reading room, the library, etc., which in each case would effect a reduction in the number of employees; also that the salaries of employees receiving over \$800 be reduced 12½ per cent, but no such salary to be less than \$800. That no extra allowances or any service be granted to any permanent employees except the Speaker's Secretary, to whom the Speaker may grant \$400 per session for his special services. That the salaries of permanent messengers who now receive from \$850 to \$600, be fixed at \$600, except the Speaker's messengers and head doorkeeper, who shall receive \$700, and the fourth messenger in messengers' room who shall receive \$500; the sessional messengers to receive \$2, and the nine pages \$1.50 per day, during the session. Any new messengers appointed to fill a vacancy among the permanent messengers to receive but \$400 per annum. That in the further distribution of the patronage due regards be had to the claims of each of the three great divisions of Canada, to wit: the Maritime Provinces, Quebec and Ontario. Each member and reporter to receive stationery to the value of \$15 per session and no more. The salary of Mr. McCarthy, assistant head messenger to be \$1,000. These recommendations to take effect on 1st July next. The committee estimated that taking as the basis a session of three months a saving of \$30,000 per annum could be effected as compared with the expenditure of the late Legislative Assembly of Canada. Having thus stated the recommendations of the committee, Mr. Langevin said there had been difference of opinion as to some of them, but taken together they presented the best result the committee could arrive at. The duty of retrenchment was in some respects a painful one, as some hardship would be caused to the employees in having their salaries reduced, and in some instances their services altogether dispensed with. The committee, however, had felt bound to look only at the question what staff of officers were required for the efficient discharge of the business of the House, and what was a reasonable compensation for their services.

Mr. Johnson said he had always thought that Responsible Government meant that members of the Government should take such a course as they thought the public interests required, and then come down and ask the House to support them. But in what position were they now placed? One of the leading members of the Government, as Chairman of a committee, had been examining whether

[Mr. Langevin (Dorchester).]

officers of this House had more salary than they ought to have. If the Government thought so, why did they not undertake the duty of making a reduction? They were shirking their responsibilities. If Mr. Langevin thought \$30,000 too much had been spent, why did he not, as a member of the Government, see to this before and have the expenditure reduced?

A Member—Better late than never.

Mr. Johnson went on to say that he wanted this reduction, but the Government would have to go further and reduce the expenses, not of the House merely, but of the departments. When a minister had a deputy at 800 pounds or 900 pounds a year and 16 clerks, there must be some reduction or the country would not stand it. The clerks in the departments were so numerous that they were in each other's way, and knocking each other's heads to get here. It was time that those who had to do with public business should seek a remedy. There should be a committee to enquire into the expenses of the departments. He was a supporter of the administration, but he had a duty to discharge to his constituents and would go for putting a stop to extravagance, however his course might affect the administration or be regarded by it.

Hon. Mr. Huntington said it was refreshing to find the honourable gentleman who had just spoken indulging, as he occasionally did, in fits of independence. He believed the committee would find the House sustaining them in their efforts to bring about retrenchment. They deserved the thanks of the House and their report was a credit to them. He reserved to himself the right, however, when they went into Committee of the Whole to discuss some points in it as to which there might be difference of opinion. He would not object to the assistant head messenger having his salary raised from \$900 to \$1,000. He was sure the members generally would consider he was well worthy of it. But he did not see what justice there was in at the same time reducing the salary of the efficient door-keeper from \$850 to \$700; nor could he see the propriety of recommending a general reduction of the salaries by a certain percentage, without inquiry whether injustice might not be done to the best officers of the House, who discharged their duties most efficiently, and who, if they had pursued other walks of life, might have risen to positions of high eminence. At all events the salaries of these men should not be reduced without giving them a little warning.