Hon. Mr. O'DONOHOE—I should be glad to do anything to favour my hon. friend, but I cannot possibly proceed with the motion until the papers come down. It is a motion of that nature, but if my hon. friend is so very anxious about it, perhaps I may not keep him even until then.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—I can assure my hon, friend that it is no fault of mine that the papers are not before the House. I have inquired for them half a dozen times. At one time I understood that they were ready to be laid before the House, but on making inquiry I learned that they were not prepared.

The motion was allowed to stand.

A CORRECTION.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE called attention to an error in the minutes of yesterday's proceedings. He said :—I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that in the minutes of yesterday's proceedings it simply mentions that the Witnesses and Evidence Bill was read the third time, not stating that the motion was carried on a division. I draw the attention to this so that the correction may be made when the journals are being prepared.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The order of the day being called—

Third reading Bill (26) "An Act further to amend the Railway Act.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL said: after the suggestion made by the hon. member from Welland last night, I made enquiry of the Railway Department and it was thought advisable to accept the suggestion made by that hon. member, for this reason; this is a road purporting to be an electric railway operated by electric power, but it is somewhat in connection or may be in connection with one of the main lines running into Niagara, and it is better that care should be taken to keep it within the provisions of the General Railway Act in case it should become a part or parcel of any of the main lines of railway. I therefore move, that the words "so long as the said railway is run or operated by electricity" be inserted in the sixth line of the fourth section after the words "the Railway Act."

The amendment was concurred in, and the Bill was then read the third time and passed.

CONTINGENT ACCOUNTS OF THE SENATE.

MOTION.

Hon. Mr. McKAY moved the adoption of the second report of the Select Committee on Contingent Accounts of the Senate. He said:—This report is printed in the minutes of yesterday: I presume hon, gentlemen have read it and that it is not necessary to make any comments upon it.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—Before adopting this report I beg to call the attention of the Senate to the sixth paragraph:—

Your committee recommend that the sessional messengers be paid the sum of \$250 for their services during the present session.

That is equal to paying messengers \$125 a Now I can see no reason why there should be any departure from the principle laid down by the Senate the year before last in connection with the sessional messengers. I find on page 351 of the report of the Committee on Contingencies of 1891, a recommendation that the sessional messengers be paid, in addition to their ordinary sessional pay \$2.50 per day for each and every day of the session beyond the 100 days, and in future sessions at the rate of \$2.50 per day. Now the recommendation of the Committee in this case gives to the messengers the advantage of the \$250, no matter how short the session may be, and if it exceeds 100 days, they get the additional \$2.50 per day the result is that we have the messengers of this House paid better than any other class of officials. I do not know what practice has been followed here, but it seems to me we should adhere strictly to the report adopted by the Senate in 1891. It does seem somewhat extravagant—if I may be permitted to use that term—to say that an ordinary messenger should receive between \$4 and \$5 a day for the work he does in this House. In dealing with public funds individually 1 have always adopted the principle of acting as nearly as possible as I would do if they were my own, treating employees liberally in all cases where there is a justification for it, but, with all due respect to the Committee, this recommendation is a piece of extravagance which is not justifiable, particularly