

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It is better to have it on the statute-book, than by an order in council, and if you do not add another clause to impose a penalty of \$100 on the person who approaches the head of a department for an increase of salary, providing that when the attempt was made the penalty would be imposed.

The clause was adopted.

On clause 45,

45. Wherever under sections 5, 8, 10, (paragraph b of subsection 1), 21, 22, 23, 24, 26 (subsection 2), 32, 33, 36 and 37, (subsection 4), any action is authorized or directed to be taken by the Governor in Council or by order in council, such action, with respect to the officers, clerks and employees of the House of Commons or the Senate, shall be taken by the House of Commons or the Senate, as the case may be, by resolution, and with respect to the officers, clerks and employees of the library of parliament, and to such other officers, clerks and employees as are under the joint control of both Houses of parliament, shall be taken by both Houses of parliament by resolution.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I should like to know what is proposed to be done to bring the officers of this House in a proper position so that they may enjoy the advantages they have at present, and at the same time be classified properly?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The clerks of the various departments are placed in the division to which they belong according to their salaries. We have already made provision for that. Then it is for the Senate to place its officers in the divisions to which they belong, taking the standard. The standard which is adopted elsewhere is the present salary.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—The present salaries should not be accepted as the standard. If that were the case, they would not rank in those divisions to which they would be entitled by reason of the precedence that had been accorded them at all state functions. Take for instance the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod; he would be in subdivision B. I do not think the clerks in subdivision A should take precedence over him. Heretofore that has not been the case. Our Sergeant at Arms would not be in the first division, but in the second division. He occupies a very much better position than would be accorded him on the salary basis. Before the House aban-

cons the rights which they have over their officers, they should see to this being rectified.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—It is a case where there is more honour than emolument.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—The question arises whether clause 35 taken in connection with clause 45 will not place our officers in a fair and proper position. I think the servants referred to in clause 35 would include the officers of this House and the House of Commons, and would preserve their status as at present. Hon. gentlemen who have given it more consideration than I have, will be able to form a conclusion as to whether clause 35 will preserve the status of those officers of this House.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I think there is no doubt about that.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I think there is every doubt.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—A resolution of this Chamber is tantamount to a rule made in the department. A resolution of the Chamber takes the same status as an order in council would in reference to a department.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I think not. Those divisions are arbitrary.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Clause 35 is the controlling clause.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—This clause simply deals with reduction and status; that has nothing to do with the question under consideration. Under the clause alluded to, there are arbitrary divisions, and under section 35 there are arbitrary divisions. Nothing the head of a department can do by order in council can change those divisions. The only way, to my mind, to make it satisfactory, is to pass a substantive clause that notwithstanding anything herein contained, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod and the Sergeant at Arms shall come under certain conditions, and then there is no doubt about it.