

latitude—though I will not enter into the discussion of the National Policy, as my hon. friend from North Bruce did—to refer to one or two points made by the speakers on the opposite side. I take it that Canadian artists will be very much gratified to learn that the hon. First Minister of this Government compares them to men who daub on pictures as on Sam Slick's clock faces, and with the remarks made here by the hon. Minister of Railways, that it was desirable that in one instance, at least, a portrait should be brought here worthy of being looked at and as something to copy after; and that to bring a portrait from England was a very desirable thing, because Canadian artists were not worthy of the name, by imputation; and that then they would have to look at a copy worthy of being considered as a work of art. Then the hon. member for North Bruce showed a tender conscience about having Englishmen characterized as foreigners. I do not wonder at the tender conscience which he exhibits, for probably he felt a twinge of conscience from the fact that, a few nights ago, he here treated these men as aliens and foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will now come to the question, which we have not been within a gunshot of for some hour or more—the contingencies of the Senate. I would be glad, if permitted, to make a few more remarks, however, in relation to the remarks made by these hon. gentlemen. I wish now to call attention to another item—to the fact that the Senate supply themselves with stationery at an expense of \$5,838 per annum, which amounts to \$71 for each Senator. The charge for the same purpose for the House of Commons is \$9,500, or an expense of some \$30 less per head than for the Senate. Now, I do say that the extravagance manifested by these hon. gentlemen of that Chamber ought to be looked after; and every comparison we make between their expenses and the expenses of the House of Commons is most unfavorable to the Senate. I wish to know if their duties are so much more onerous than ours that they do double the correspondence which we do, and if there is any reason why it should cost the Senators about \$30 per head more for stationery allowance than for the House of Commons. It strikes me that \$71 per head for each Senator is a most extravagant and most unjust expenditure under that head, and I call attention to that matter; also to another matter. Here is a reading room maintained for the Senate, to be paid for from the House of Commons. Why should not these appropriations be put together for a reading room for both Assemblies? We could spend then for this purpose \$3,000 and save \$1,000, and have a reading room better than either one which we have to-day; and I think that this suggestion is worthy of consideration. I do not know, indeed, whether these hon. gentlemen would associate with the hon. members of the House of Commons in a common reading room, but that is the only reason which can be assigned for any other arrangement than having one in place of two. Certainly, the distance to travel is only a few feet more for the members of one or either Chamber, and a \$3,000 appropriation would secure a much better room for both than \$4,000 for two rooms. I think that this suggestion is a very practical one, and that my suggestion as to the stationery allowance business ought to be looked after. It is not quite so bad, however, as it is at Washington, where the members of the House of Representatives vote themselves gold pens, dressing cases, writing desks, and libraries, &c., at an expense of \$500 or \$600; but certainly \$71 per head is too much for an ordinary, reasonable, and economical allowance for stationery; and there is something concealed in that, which ought not to be. I am perfectly well aware, that the House of Commons allowance is an extravagant allowance; I know that we make use of more stationery than is necessary, the

Mr. CHARLTON.

stationery and ink given to each member of the House of Commons furnishes three times the amount of stationery which we require in the course of the year; but a nearly double allowance is certainly an act of great extravagance, as is done in the case of the Senate.

33. House of Commons, salaries per Clerk's Estimate. \$61,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I see that there is an increase of \$400 in the salary of the Assistant Clerk of the House of Commons. I think that he was paid \$2,000 last year, and I notice that this year the amount is \$2,400. If I mistake not, the Assistant Clerk who sat at the Table last year, Mr. Leprohon, was superannuated at an allowance of \$1,531, I think. His place is worthily filled, I am happy to say, by a gentleman who receives \$400 more than the gentleman who was superannuated; so we have a superannuation charge of \$1,500 and we are paying an additional charge of \$400 to the salary of the present Assistant Clerk, which makes \$1,900 more for this service—

Mr. BLAKE. Then we are paying Piché's superannuation.

Mr. ROSS—than we were paying last year, and then the old Assistant Clerk, who sat at this Table, also receives a superannuation allowance; hence we have two superannuated Assistant Clerks, drawing between them \$3,000 or \$4,000, and an active Assistant Clerk who does the work for \$2,400. Can we get any explanation for this? If I mistake not, Mr. Leprohon is quite as physically able as he was last year. I have met him frequently since the House met, and conversed with him; he looks quite lively and seems quite able and in the full possession of his faculties. I do not think that the House will cordially approve of the superannuation of an efficient officer, who had been long in the service and filled the position worthily, in order that his position might be given to some other gentleman, no matter what his qualifications are. I await an explanation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The discussion just now is as to the salaries of the House of Commons, but the hon. gentleman is going into the question of the superannuation of previous officers, a separate matter.

Mr. ROSS. It is a cognate subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will be quite ready to discuss it and bring down the papers connected with the superannuation of Mr. Piché, if this is desired, and of Mr. Leprohon too, when the proper time arrives, but that stands quite apart.

Mr. ROSS. I do not know as to that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; it is quite apart.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You cannot discuss this question without discussing those two cases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, you can. The hon. gentleman is quite open to attack the Government for the superannuation of these two officers, and censure it if he thinks proper. They are superannuated and are no longer officers of this House; that is done, and we must take the censure, if we are censurable for the removal of these officers, on the proper course being taken, and the proper notice being given. But the question now is as to the salary of the Clerk Assistant. Mr. Leprohon received \$2,300—\$2,000 as clerk assistant and \$300 as secretary to the Speaker. His successor was appointed first at \$2,000, but it was thought by the Committee on Internal Economy that considering the important duties he had to perform, he should receive \$2,400. If the hon. gentleman will look back to the Senate he will find that the clerk assistant there, with half the work, gets \$2,800.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). There is no economy in the arrangement, because the assistant sergeant-at-arms gets