

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—I trust that the hon. gentleman will not take my remarks as being personal—I did not refer to him personally. I meant to refer to the Government as a whole.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—I have already given my views on this question and I have not changed them. When I spoke on the subject, had a vote been taken I should probably have recorded mine against the Bill. But to-day I must deal with the matter as it stands before us. The Government having done what I believe is right towards our messengers, or at least having given them a portion of what they are entitled to, I shall not vote against this Bill. We must approve of what has been done in the other House. The members of that body having decided that there is a justification this year for allowing six days absence of any member without reducing his sessional indemnity, I should not like to condemn their judgment. While I am not in favour of the principle of this Bill, I believe that the sessional indemnity ought to be larger than it is. Public men who devote themselves to their duties should receive more than \$1,000 a year. However, in this instance that is not the question before us; we are simply asked to declare that a member shall not suffer a reduction of his indemnity unless he has been absent more than six days during the session. If the House is divided on this question, I shall vote for the Bill.

Hon. Mr. SMITH—At this late stage of the session, and inasmuch as we are not responsible for this Bill, I think it is bad taste to find fault with those who are responsible to the country for their action. It is a small matter, and not one calculated to improve the character of this House to give such prominence to this particular motion. The hon. gentlemen who are opposing this Bill were quite willing recently to vote away the public money to people who had not earned it, but they are ready to-day to find fault with a Bill which comes to us endorsed by the House of Commons. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways. The hon. member from New Westminster was one of those who would have voted away the public money improperly this week had the House allowed him to do so. Since we are not responsible for this Bill, I cannot see why the hon. gentleman opposes it, unless his

object is to make a little political capital at the end of the session. He has had so very little to find fault with this session that we should forgive him for seizing upon this opportunity to make a point against the majority.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I rise simply for the purpose of asking the hon. gentleman from New Westminster not to demand a division on this Bill. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman from Toronto that it is bad taste to discuss it. I think the bad taste was in introducing the measure and passing it; but inasmuch as we are not responsible for it and cannot defeat it, it would be better not to have a division. I hope the expression of opinion here to-day may have the effect of preventing the introduction of such measures in the future.

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

## HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

### FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

A Message was received from the House of Commons with Bill (116) "An Act to amend the Homestead Exemption Act."

The Bill was read the first time.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL moved that the rule be suspended, and that the Bill be read the second time at length at the Table. He said:—Under the statute regulating homestead exemptions in the North-west each settler is allowed to hold 80 acres free from seizure. The Manitoba Legislature passed an Act extending the exemption to 160 acres. That Act was declared *ultra vires* of their power under the Constitution. A motion was introduced in the other House by Mr. Davin to repeal the clause altogether. That would have the effect of leaving the settlers without an exemption whatever from seizure. The Minister of the Interior did not think that that would be justice to the settlers, particularly those who had selected homesteads in the North-west under the Act providing for the exemption of 80 acres, and instead of repealing the provision altogether, this Bill provides for the repeal of the section limiting the exemption to 80 acres and extends it to 160 acres. This Bill will confer a greater benefit on the settlers than they enjoy under the present law.