

belly of the animal, and, as the hon. gentleman has said, 6 or 8 inches wide. That has been the system of packing mess and prime mess. There was, I think, another grade called "clear"—that is, pork without the bone. I do not see that mentioned at all.

HON. MR. POWER—I find, looking carefully at the section of the Inspection Act which this Bill is intended to amend, that the Bill does not deal with mess or prime mess pork at all. What is now the first section of the Bill deals only with sub-section 1 of section 52, and if the hon. gentleman will look at the Inspection Act he will find that sub-section 2 of section 52 deals with mess pork, and describes what it shall be. Sub-section 3 deals with extra prime pork, and describes what it shall be; sub-section 4 with prime mess pork and sub-section 5 with prime pork. The law is not altered as to these at all. What is now clause 2 of this Bill adds two new sub-sections between sub-sections 6 and 7 of this section of the Act. It does not apply to Prince Edward Island pork at all, as far as I can gather.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—This present Bill does not make any difference in the size of the peices into which the pork is to be cut. It appears from a cursory glance at it that under the law as it stands in the Statute-book it is to be cut certain sizes. There is a difference in the number of grades, apparently, as these are only five by the General Inspection Act and they are made seven by this Bill, so there is not so great a change as my hon. friend supposes.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

THE CONTINGENT ACCOUNTS OF THE SENATE.

THIRD REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ADOPTED.

The Order of the Day being called,—Consideration of the Third Report of the Select Committee appointed to examine and report upon the Contingent Accounts of the Senate.

HON. MR. READ said—This report recommends that a person named Davis be superannuated for physical incapacity, and also that certain appointments be made.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I rise with some hesitancy to speak on this matter. I see that the committee has not changed in effect the report made to the House on the 14th of February, and which did not meet with approval, or rather was sent back to the committee for further consideration. I see no alteration in the report except, as has been remarked to me, that it gives the ground why Davis should be superannuated, which was not mentioned on the former occasion. I do not approve of this report, because I see that Davis is employed in the House yet, and there is no appearance of physical incapacity about him. He appears to be as capable now as he ever was. I never heard of a man being superannuated who was doing his work satisfactorily and when he did not want to be superannuated. Unless some reason better than any that has yet been furnished is given for taking this course, I must disapprove of the report. I believe there is something behind this recommendation. It is said that Davis has been injured in some way that would incapacitate him from heavy lifting or anything of that kind, but I think he is capable of performing the duties imposed upon him in this House. It is a dangerous precedent to establish to superannuate a young man. Why should we pay two men for doing the work of one? Why should we put a charge of \$250 a year on the contingencies of the Senate without cause? I am told that this young man's habits have not been good. Has he been admonished with regard to any weakness of that kind, and put on probation, and given to understand that unless he pursues a better course he will be summarily dismissed? It seems that nothing of the kind has been done—that he has not been cautioned by the committee, but is to be superannuated, while to all appearances he is as capable of performing his duties here as he ever was. It seems to me that to take the course recommended by the committee is to offer a premium to men in our employ to neglect their duties and to fall into evil habits in order to be superannuated. It is not fair to the other servants of this House that we should, because this young man has been guilty of some indiscretion, superannuate him and put an unnecessary charge on the Senate. I understand that the young man has taken the pledge and promised to do his work faithfully and