

when we are dealing with money that is not our own. I therefore move that the sixth paragraph of this report be struck out.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—Before that is carried, I think it is due to myself and a number of the members of the Committee to say a few words, more particularly as I happen to be the member who moved in the matter and suggested the recommendation. Until 1891 the sessional messengers always received \$250, no matter whether the session was long or short; but the session of 1891 was an exceedingly long one, extending over five months, and an additional indemnity of \$500 was granted to the members of both Houses of Parliament, and a recommendation was made by the Committee on Contingencies that the sessional messengers' pay ought to be increased if the session exceeded 100 days. That was adopted, but I think I am perfectly safe in saying that very few, very few indeed understood the amendment moved by Sir John Abbott, that in future sessions they should receive at the rate of \$250. If this session closes in a day or two, as seems very probable, it will be one of the shortest sessions since Confederation. If the motion made by the hon. the leader of the House is carried, the sessional allowance for these messengers will be reduced to about \$160. I think that this is an exceedingly small matter. The additional \$80 or \$90 would only amount to about \$550, and I think that if the Government were endeavouring to economise, they would apply the pruning knife in other directions where larger sums are spent without that care and supervision that is applied in this case. It would be only fair and right that they should grant the regular allowance to those poor people whose time for the balance of the year will be practically of no account. As it was promised in the Committee yesterday that a revision of all the salaries should be made at the beginning of next session, I think it is only right, generous and just on our part that we should grant the \$250 as recommended in the report.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—My hon. friend says that this is only a small matter, but we should deal with small matters on the same principle as we deal with large matters. We should act with the same care and prudence as if it were a matter concerning ourselves. I cannot understand the reason that my

hon. friend has given for the change at all. We know well enough there are many persons clamoring for the positions—men who could not get half as much outside, and it is an unpleasant matter to deal with here. We come in daily contact with these messengers, and they perform many duties for us, yet I must support the Minister in his contention that it is contrary to all rule and principle to adopt this recommendation. We have established the rule that for a session of one hundred days we shall allow \$250, and if it is less than that it must be reduced.

Hon. Mr. POWER—If we were fixing the pay of the messengers now for the first time, I should be disposed to agree with the hon. leader of the Government; but for the last fifteen years the sessional messengers of this House have been paid at the rate of \$250 a session, just as the members of the House have been paid \$1,000 a session, and I do not think there is any more reason for cutting down the pay of the messengers than there is for cutting down the pay of the members. I have not heard any hon. gentlemen propose that the pay of the members should be reduced. It is perfectly true that at the close of the session of 1891 an amendment was moved to the report of the Committee on Contingent Accounts to the effect mentioned by the hon. leader of the House. I do not think as a rule that it was understood at the time that that was the object of the amendment, and the impression on the minds of members of the House and the impression on the minds of the messengers themselves, up to two or three days ago, was that they were to be paid the usual \$250. I do not think that this House would like to do a thing which is to a certain extent unfair. These messengers have been under the impression that they were to be paid \$250, and I think, without giving them any notice of the change, it is rather hard and unfair that this change should be made. Now that attention has been called to the matter and the intimation has been given that the whole scale of salaries is to be revised at the beginning of the next session, the messengers will be prepared for a possible reduction. I do not agree with the view taken by the hon. leader of the Government and by the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg, that in dealing with the officers or employes of this House you are to consider for what sum you might get people to do the same