

moved ; then there is a list of corrections, all of which would appear in the final list. It would lead to endless confusion if these preliminary lists were printed at the bureau. In my county, for example, if the revising officer experiences any difficulty, he can easily consult some one in the immediate locality and settle the matter finally. Ultimately the final list is printed at the bureau here and is easily done.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) evidently did not understand what I meant to convey, which was that a very large saving might be effected if the whole of the lists were printed in the counties where the lists are made up. I have no doubt that a large sum of money would be saved in doing so, because when the preliminary lists are set up in the country offices the names are ready to be inserted in the final list. When it comes here to the bureau all these names have to be re-set. I contend that the Government would save money if they had the preliminary and final lists printed in the offices outside.

Mr. HUGHES. The only difficulty in that respect is, that it would require a larger amount of type than many of the outside offices have at their disposal. In every other respect the statement is correct.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That experiment was tried once. The first list was printed under the superintendence of the Auditor General and the whole printing was done outside and amounted to about \$180,000. When the work was entrusted to the Queen's Printer, this plant was purchased and the final list was published in the bureau. The saving of cost on that in one year was equal to the cost of the whole plant employed in the printing the final lists in the bureau.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Minister forgets that the payment for the first list was at the rate of 12 cents a name, and they only allow 3 cents now. The Government wanted to give the country printers a benefit when they paid them 12 cents.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no doubt that what my hon. friend (Mr. Somerville) suggests would be very popular among the newspapers, but as to this whole question the Queen's Printer—whom hon. gentlemen opposite will admit is a good business man, and who runs the bureau as a business man—says that the method adopted now is the most economical. I discussed the subject with him and that is his opinion.

To pay Hugh Sutherland, late M.P. for Winnipeg, balance of sessional indemnity, 1886 \$469

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know much about the merits of this matter, but whether it be well founded or illfounded, a very strong case ought to be made out in its favour, and a strong protest ought

Mr. HUGHES.

to be entered against allowing claims which have not been put forward for nine or ten years, being presented to us. I can conceive nothing more improper than allowing eight or ten years, and as we have seen in old times, thirteen or fourteen years, to elapse, before accounts are rendered to the Government. We should have some explanation why this claim is brought forward at such a late date. On what possible grounds are we asked to pay this money, and what is the justification for it?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know that I should attempt to give the hon. gentleman a justification for this claim further than this: In my opinion claims for sessional indemnity, inasmuch as that the sessional indemnity is statutory, are always exigible until they are paid. I have taken the ground with regard to other claims of this nature, made within a reasonable period of time—that is one or two years after the session in which the indemnity accrued—that I had the right to authorize the accountant to pay these claims, when the necessary statutory declaration was made. With regard to this particular claim, the facts are as follows:—Mr. Sutherland, in the session of 1886, came to Ottawa in the beginning of the session. He remained here for a certain number of days—fourteen, I think—and I understand he then went to England and did not return until the session was over. Prior to leaving here, he drew the full amount of mileage, and \$91 sessional indemnity at the rate of \$7 a day. He never made a declaration upon which the accountant could pay him the balance of the indemnity for that session of 1886; but during the year 1893, he did present to me a statutory declaration which under the law would entitle him to the amount now placed in the Estimates. As more than six years had elapsed, I would not undertake to authorize the accountant to pay that sum to Mr. Sutherland, without a vote of Parliament, although I confess that legally, I think, he was entitled to it. An application was, I understand, made by Mr. Sutherland to the Minister of Finance, and the opinion which I held with regard to the indemnity being exigible until it was paid, was, I am informed, confirmed by the Department of Justice. Upon that report the Government placed this amount in the Estimates to pay Mr. Sutherland the sum which he could have obtained at the end of the session of 1886, if he had made the necessary statutory declaration.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The days he was absent are deducted from the sessional allowance?

Mr. SPEAKER. My recollection is that the declaration was made out in the proper statutory form, and the deductions of the days during which he was absent during