

years ago. He did not believe that the members of this House could plume themselves on having cut off 12.5 per cent from the salaries of officers. The people at large rather desired a reduction of useless officers, if there were such, than the paring down of the salaries of efficient men.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Peel) had no doubt whatever that if a large number of the officers engaged in the work of the House were removed, it would be difficult to replace them, and if in any other position they would be paid larger salaries than here. The whole of the expenditure saved by the reduction of 12.5 per cent was only \$7,000 a year. He also referred to the anomaly of messengers of this House who received \$2 per day or about \$120, whilst messengers of the Senate received \$200, although their duties were not nearly so onerous.

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU quite agreed in the motion of the hon. member for Lanark North (Hon. Mr. McDougall). He had disapproved of the reduction of salaries when it was made, and would rejoice at this change for the better. The hon. member for Lanark had spoken of the claims of an officer who was at the table. He (Hon. Mr. Chauveau) also saw at the table an officer who had for many years sat at the clerk's table, and who for many years had performed the difficult task of French translator.

Mr. McDONALD (Lunenburg) thought that the pay of the sessional clerks should be increased. The pay now, he thought, was quite insufficient to compensate these officers for their services. An officer thus employed could not engage in any other pursuit. He urged that a bonus should be given which should represent the amount which had been taken from them during the past few years.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD reminded the House that the question of salaries had been referred to a Committee of the House in the first Session of this Parliament. The Committee had reported in favour of a reduction of 12.5 per cent, and the House had adopted their report. It would not look well in the country on the last day of the last Session to make their last vote reverse an Act of the same Parliament. It would be remembered that this report recommending a reduction of 12.5 per cent was carried at the instance of the Government to prevent a still greater reduction being made.

He did not think that they should at the present time, with their power leaving their hands, pass a motion which would, in fact, involve the reversal of the policy adopted by the Committee and the House, as it proposed the payment to the officers of the amount which had been taken from them, and would involve a very large sum of money. He would have been well contented had this reduction not been made; but as the matter was, he did not think it would look well if such an increase were made as now proposed.

If the hon. gentleman thought fit, he might refer the matter to the internal economy committee to consider during recess. That many of the officers were worthy of all consideration, he knew; and the attention of the committee might be called to their case, and they might be requested to deal with their salaries for the present year. It

might be understood that the internal economy commissioners could increase the salaries to the extent of 12.5 per cent for the next year, save in some exceptional cases when it might not be deserved, and leave to a new Parliament to adjust the whole system.

He quite agreed with the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. He had seconded the motion, as he approved of the spirit of it, but he did not quite catch the sense of it as carrying them back over the five years. He did not think that would be proper. He thought it inconsistent with parliamentary practice to pass an act having a retroactive effect; and they must, he thought, confine themselves to the present and future.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL (Lanark North) said that the leader of the Government having indicated another mode of dealing with this matter, he would consent to it. His motion he thought had not gone so far as was stated. It merely asked to apply the provisions of the Civil Service Act to these salaries as regarded increase, and to put the officers of the House on the same footing as those in the Departments.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said that at the time that the report referred to was adopted he had thought that it was unjust to make an indiscriminate reduction of salaries, and he thought that it would be equally wrong now to make an indiscriminate increase. He thought that there were many officers who deserved increases, indeed he had spoken to several of the officials who would have got better salaries had they gone into other services. They, however, disliked to leave as they preferred the service and hoped that before long justice might be done them.

He would suggest the following motion: "That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that such of the officers and clerks of the House as the Committee of Internal Economy may consider to deserve it, should have such an addition to their salaries as would compensate them for their service for the current year."

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD had no objection to the motion, which having been amended in two unimportant particulars, was put to the vote and carried:—Yeas, 53; Nays, 21.

(Division No. 50)

YEAS

Members

Barthe	Blanchet
Bolton	Brousseau
Cameron (Peel)	Campbell
Carling	Carter
Cartier (Sir George-É.)	Cartwright
Cayley	Chauveau
Currier	Daoust
De Cosmos	Delorme (Saint-Hyacinthe)
Fortin	Grant
Gray	Harrison
Heath	Hincks (Sir Francis)
Holton	Houghton
Killam	Langevin
Langlois	Macdonald (Sir John A.)