

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Before that is adopted, there is some information I should like to obtain. It seems to me this schedule does not correspond with the classification which we adopted a few days ago. I find under the Civil Service Bill, which we considered yesterday, it is provided that:

In the case of any officer, clerk or employee who has received an increase of salary upon organization and classification under the said Act, such increase shall be offset against the increase which such person might otherwise receive under this Act.

All others are entitled to the increase. In the schedule now under consideration, under second division subdivision B, there are only five of the employees of the Senate recommended for this increase. Now, upon reference to the classification which this Chamber adopted a few days ago, we find there are six employees of the Senate in that particular subdivision of division A; that is six employees in subdivision B of the second division. I understand that the housekeeper and superintendent of messengers has been omitted from this class, although he has been classified in the Senate classification and that he is not entitled to the increase. I would point out that that officer has not received an increase in salary, because on reference to the classification it will be found that he is in a class running from \$800 to \$1,600. His salary is stated in the classification of \$1,300 which he has been receiving for some time, and there has been no increase of that salary. He, therefore, has been cut out of that particular class, and the other five have been recommended for the increase.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—If the hon. gentleman will look at the list he will find that a stenographer was recently appointed at \$1,000 a year, Mr. Hinds, and he will not come under the increase.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—He has been put in it.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—The hon. member is speaking of only five and there are six in that class, so that Mr. Hinds will not be counted. There are five without him.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—If it appears in the minutes that the five excludes Mr. Hinds, and includes Mr. Carleton, I have no more to say.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I think there is no doubt about it.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG—There should be in the report the names of those who are included in the various classifications.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I think the hon. gentleman is losing sight of the fact that the housekeeper, in addition to his salary of \$1,300, occupies rooms which are worth something additional.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Not in the classification.

Hon. Mr. POWER—In the other House that is the case, and that is the case with Carleton. His rooms are worth \$600, I should say.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—That is not the point. He has always had \$1,300 and those rooms; consequently, under the classification, he stands to-day where he stood previous to the classification, and he has not received an increase; therefore, he would be entitled to that increase. I will accept the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman from Portage la Prairie, that the names be added, and that it appears in the minutes that Hinds is not one of the five mentioned. I am told it was intended to place him there.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—He is engaged this session as a stenographer at \$1,000 a year. He was not employed on the 1st of September, and I do not suppose for a moment that he would be considered entitled to the increase.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—If he was not there on the 1st September, Mr. Nicholson was not there either.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Nicholson does not get an increase.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—To shorten it up, is it to appear in the minutes that Hinds is not one of the five mentioned in this class?

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—I think we should have the names mentioned. I ask that his honour the Speaker be pleased to give us the names.