

by parliament because the cost of living had considerably increased in the past five or six years, and there is no justification for the Senate messengers and packers being shut out. In the House of Commons, they are all mentioned. Our messengers are worthy men and good men and some of them have been here for twenty-five years, and they have reached the limit and cannot go any higher, and with the increased cost of living they should have shared in the advantage given by this Act. It was intended to be shared in by all.

The CHAIRMAN—The clerk informs me that the reason why the packers in the House of Commons got an increase, was because they were below the maximum, and all our packers and messengers are up to the maximum.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I call attention to the fact that no portion of this applies to the parties who have reached the maximum salary. Here is the clause :

3. No increase under this Act to any officer, clerk or employee shall exceed the difference between his present salary and the maximum salary of the subdivision in which he has been placed upon organization and classification under the said Act.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—That being the law, could we, in our classification, grant an additional sum to those who have attained the maximum? It seems to me we cannot. Have the messengers who are serving in the Senate arrived at the maximum according to law?

Hon. Mr. POWER—By the next session I think there will be a means found to provide for the cases of these messengers, but we had to base our classification on the condition of things on September 1st, and we did so, in fact, the committee recommended increases for two or three messengers, and they could not get it because the law did not allow them; but we hope to be able to make some arrangement next session. In the report which is now on the table, we did provide for the case of one disappointed individual.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I do not agree with the hon. gentleman when he says we were bound to take the salaries of the 1st September. If we are bound to take them

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

on the 1st September, let him show me the clause that makes that provision. He cannot find any clause in the Act. On the contrary, the law provides that as soon as practicable after the coming into force of the Act, the head of each department shall cause the organization of each department to be determined and defined by order in council. That is, on a resolution of the Senate, and how is that to be done? It has to be done according to clause 5 and clause 5 says :

“The first division shall be divided into: subdivision A, consisting of officers having the rank of deputy heads, not being deputy heads, administering department, assistant deputy ministers, and the principal technical and administrative and executive officers.”

And so in subdivision B. We are always bound by the law to make the classification as the law provides; but if we fail to do so, then the House of Commons fails to vote the money for that class, and the increase given will be based on the salary fixed on the 1st of September last; but it is only in case we do not act, because we are empowered to act, and I think it is an obligation on our part, in justice to our employees, to make the subdivision as the law indicates. We did not do that. That clause, which does not apply here, enacts that our employees should have the salaries they received on the 1st September last, and this is not fair to them.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—The Internal Economy Committee, when they fixed the salaries of our employees for the present session, properly anticipated the provisions of section 2—at least I did—what might be contained in this Act, section 2, that in the case of a messenger who was at the maximum, we could not exceed it. We have said that the maximum salary to be paid to a Senate messenger is \$800. We anticipated what has taken place and fixed the salaries we thought ought to be fair, and we moved all our officials who were only receiving \$700 up to \$800 and all the messengers of the Senate staff to-day have reached the maximum, with the exception of one who was only appointed as a permanent messenger this year with a salary of \$700. It would not be right to anticipate that because somebody else was receiving an increase in some other class a messenger who was placed in that parti-