

EXPENDITURES IN RESPECT OF LEGISLATION.

REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE.

The Order of the Day being called—

Consideration of the report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the expenditure in respect to legislation and the practicability of reducing the same.

HON. MR. ABBOTT said: The more I think of this report the more I am satisfied that it ought to contain a similar statement of the position of the Commons to that which it contains with reference to the Senate, and by means of a similar schedule. I know that such a schedule was prepared, and I cannot understand its absence from the report. There are a few figures I would like to give the House in making this remark, that will show the importance of the schedule:

THE SENATE.

1877—Total expenditure.....	\$ 135,614 90
1888. “ “	159,320 88

Total increase in 11 years...\$ 23,705 98

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

1877. Total expenditure.....	\$ 357,743 95
1888. “ “	491,198 69

Total increase in 11 years...\$133,454 74

The increase in the expenditure of the Senate was about one-sixth; the increase in the expenditure of the Commons was about two-fifths. That shows the necessity for this comparative statement that was spoken of at the meeting earlier to-day. I therefore move that the report be not now considered, but that it be referred back to the said committee, in order that there may be appended thereto a schedule of the officers of the House of Commons, and their salaries, similar to that contained with regard to the Senate in Schedule “A” of the said report.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the motion is a very proper and desirable one, but before it is adopted I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if there is any truth in the statement which has been made, that in the other Chamber they do not propose to proceed with the consideration of the report this year?

HON. MR. MILLER—I do not think the hon. gentleman's question is in order. It

is very desirable, whatever the fate of this report may be, that such a schedule should be got in and annexed to the report; therefore, I do not think it is prudent just now—I will not say it is improper—to put any question at present with regard to what has occurred in reference to this report in the House of Commons.

HON. MR. WARK—I would like to call the attention of members of the committee of this House to a very singular anomaly in the report. It is recommended that in future appointments the salaries of chief messenger, door-keeper and Speaker's messenger are to begin at \$400, while other messengers, receiving \$500, if promoted to the position of permanent messengers, must begin at a lower salary than they were receiving as ordinary sessional messengers. I think that is an anomaly which ought not to exist; they ought to begin at \$500, when promoted to permanent messengers, the salary they would be receiving at the time of their promotion.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. POWER—Now that this motion is adopted, I think it is perfectly in order to ask the question which I put a moment ago.

HON. MR. MILLER—I think it puts the House in a false position. If the report comes back to us, then anything can be said.

HON. MR. POWER—I fail to see that there is anything improper in asking the question. We have just been dealing with the report of another joint committee, which was not in the same position as this at all, and it was not thought improper to go to the other Chamber to ascertain what position that report was in, and the leader came back and informed us of the exact position in which the report stood. Why should there be any inconsistency in treating this report in the same way? We know that this report has not been adopted in the other House, and that its consideration has been postponed, and I only wish to elicit the information in a more authoritative way.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I do not know anything about what has been done in the other House officially; I have only learned