

cular class, the maximum being \$800, should have any additional increase. I do not think it is right to say they are unfairly treated, because messengers in other places, mentioned here, who were not receiving the maximum, get it under this Bill. They get the \$150 as the case might be, up to the maximum of that class: I cannot see the unfairness. We have one rather peculiar case on our staff, where one of the permanent messengers was only in the Senate for about 2 years and he is in the \$900 class; but I suppose that messenger will get the benefit of the increase, because he has not reached the maximum of the class he is in. That is McLeod Wood. He is in the Speaker's department, and was taken, on two years ago at \$75 a month. He was in charge of the restaurant last year, and was appointed as a messenger at \$900 a year.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—The messengers are not classified.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—We have classified them by the report adopted here a few days ago. We were asked, under the Act, to classify them and we did so, and that particular messenger, although only a messenger in the House, is in a class that runs from \$900 to \$1,200, and the others are at the maximum of \$800, with the exception of one appointed this year.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—We have put one at \$900.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—We did it last year.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Take it at \$900; that does not give him a right to be classified in the subdivision of \$900. If he is nothing else but a messenger, he remains with the messengers.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—The Act says that in no case shall you reduce the person's salary by placing him in a different class, and we felt that as that gentleman was receiving \$900, we had to place him in that particular class.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—That we had no right to do. The law says nothing in this Act shall reduce the status of a clerk or employee in the service. It does not speak of a messenger at all.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Or his pay.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—And if his salary is less than the minimum salary of his subdivision in this class, his salary may be increased to the maximum. The section reads:

"Any person whether permanent or temporary who is in receipt of a salary at or above the maximum as heretofore established of the class, permanent or temporary, in which he is then serving shall on the expiry of one year after his having been in receipt of such salary be eligible for the increase of salary provided by this Act."

I suppose it will be understood that the gentleman who is the deputy head shall make a report to the head, so that the \$150, which is provided by this law, shall be paid this year. If the Senate does not adopt the report, nothing could be done.

Hon. Mr. POWER—As I understand, this recommendation has already been drawn up.

Hon. Mr. GIBSON, from the committee, reported the Bill with amendments.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved that the amendments be concurred in.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Is not this a money Bill? If it is, what right have we to amend it?

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—We certainly have not a right to amend a money Bill.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—We could find some precedents for amending a money Bill in this House. I remember one occasion when the hon. member from De Lorimier (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) moved to strike out a clause in a money Bill, and although the Speaker decided that it was not in order, his decision was reversed by the House.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—In that case, there was no increase of charges on the treasury. This is a similar case. We were in order then and we are in order now.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The Bill provided for an increase, and the clause which provided for that increase was struck out. That was clearly amending a money Bill.