

days and \$60 for thirty-one days. They were not dealing with this question for this session only but for future sessions. It was reasonable to suppose that their sessions would be very much shorter than were the sessions of the old Canadian Parliament, and it would be unfair to pay themselves a sum based upon the sessions of that Parliament.

Mr. Holton was surprised that the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Internal Revenue should acquiesce in the statement that a sessional allowance worked satisfactorily in the late Province of Canada. It was adopting a system used in New York and applicable in that country to a different system of Government from this country. The pay members get there is \$3.00 per day, and the time of the session limited to one hundred days. They meet on a fixed day, and it is in their own power to shorten the time of the session. Here they meet at the call of the Executive, in whose hands are all important measures, and they rise not by their own will, but by the will of Ministers. He had known Ministers in former times bring in measures at the heel of the session, which were passed through without receiving proper consideration in Parliament. That mode of indemnifying members of Parliament is not applicable to the British system of Government. Under that mode they could not get a session closed under thirty days, but after that time had expired, a great number of members would feel they were staying at the seat of Government at their own expense, and they would be impatient if any member, in the discharge of public duties, sought to enforce upon Parliament a proper consideration for the measures submitted to it. They should adopt such a system of indemnity as would pay members for whatever time the exigencies of the public service required them to stay here.

Hon. Mr. McDougall said that he had always endeavoured to vote for any question that came before the House, if he believed it for the public interest for the time being. He did not think that there was any member in this Parliament, who was a member of the late Parliament of Canada, but he would say that under this rule of sessional allowance the session had been shorter and the expenses less, than under the old rule of paying members by the day. Before they adopted the new mode, he had known sessions to be prolonged to upwards of six months.

Mr. Fisher said that they looked to Canada for a precedent in this matter, without any [Mr. Blake (Durham West)]

regard to what had been the practice in the Maritime Provinces. He did not think that the mileage proposed was just to these Provinces. The mileage was to be paid according to distance by the nearest mail route, but they could not travel by that route. In Canada the facilities for travelling were such that the expenses were very light, and they could calculate just what they would be, but the case was different in the Maritime Provinces, where there were not the same facilities, and delays were occasioned by heavy falls of snow. He had spent one day in travelling twelve miles on the road to Fredericton. In New Brunswick the rate of mileage was one shilling per mile each way, and this, he thought, was none too much.

Sir John A. Macdonald said if he could be shown that the rate of mileage was unjust to the Maritime Provinces, it should be rectified. His honourable friend must remember that if the mileage of New Brunswick members was less than they had been accustomed to receive their pay was increased from \$4 to \$6 per day. Thus they would receive a larger amount at the close of the session than they would receive in their own Province. In moving the Address, his honourable friend had given members from Upper Canada a speech on economy which had sunk deep in their hearts. He said the general belief in New Brunswick was that we were extravagant and he cautioned us to try by every reasonable means to remove that impression. Now, on the first attempt they made to correct that impression his honourable friend was going to vote against it. If the pay of members was insufficient he would sooner increase it than have the amount made up in the mileage. If members wish to increase the indemnity let them express it and the Government will consider it, though he considered if they had erred at all it had been on the side of liberality—previous to their adopting a sessional allowance in the old Parliament of Canada, it was alleged in the newspapers that their session lingered on for five or six months because some members did not care about going home when they were in comfortable quarters, receiving six dollars per day. To do away with that impression we made a calculation what the ordinary time of a session would be and we came to the conclusion that a bona fide business session could be compressed, and that six hundred dollars was sufficient pay for each member; after that it did happen that their sessions were condensed into a reasonable compass. In regard to the present Parliament, he thought