

fishermen if the \$5,270 which was paid to the Sadie Mac had been distributed among the fishermen. It might be mentioned that this boat is owned by a very good friend of the government. That boat carried 32,550 pounds of fish at a cost of \$5,270. The fishermen could have eaten their fish, or salted them down, and the distribution of this amount among them would have been much better. The minister says that suitable boats could not be obtained, and he enters into a contract for five years with Mr. R. W. Hendry of Halifax for the five boats. Why was it necessary to enter into a contract for that period? The minister could have gone along the coast of Nova Scotia and obtained all the boats he required on a monthly rental basis. He could have obtained any number of boats at a rental of from \$1,200 to \$1,700 per month with the option of cancelling the charter on a month's notice. Instead of that he enters into a contract for 5 years for five boats at a rental of \$1,975 each per month.

Item agreed to.

Legislation — House of Commons — salaries, \$257,610.

Expenses of committees, clerical assistance, etc., \$11,950.

Contingencies, \$46,775.

Publishing debates, \$60,000.

Estimates of Sergeant-at-Arms, \$188,394.—  
Total, \$664,729.

Mr. KENNEDY: I believe this is the item covering the temporary staff of the House of Commons. Is any allowance being made to them on account of the short session? I am referring to the Hansard and members' stenographic staffs.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been in the house almost every minute for several days. Yesterday I heard what was said in the house by the two leaders. I do not know whether the hon. member for Acadia spoke, but I suppose he shared the views of both leaders, and I will act accordingly. I saw the leader of the opposition this morning. Although I am nearer to the Prime Minister, I have not yet had an opportunity of conferring with him. There is to be a conference and on the broad principle of acting generously the committee can depend I shall do the right thing.

Mr. HARRIS: I should like to know whether this also covers the protective staff. These men, as the Speaker knows, are mostly married men, with families, and I trust they will receive the same consideration as the stenographic staff.

[Mr. Short.]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentlemen should not confuse those that are permanent with those that are temporary. I will have regard to the temporary ones when reviewing this matter with the leaders.

Mr. HARRIS: But as a matter of fact, a number of the protective staff are temporary during the session.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will review the whole question with both leaders and the hon. gentleman can be assured that I shall deal generously with the staff, having regard to what was asked yesterday by hon. members.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It seems to me that a very important principle is involved. There is a distinct discrimination between the staff of the House of Commons and that of the Senate. Why there should be, I do not know.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me tell my hon. friend at once: the Senate itself deals with its own employees. It appoints its officers; it appoints its servants as it pleases. The House of Commons is in a different position. Our appointments come under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I quite understand that, but that is what I am protesting about. The people of Canada pay both Senate and House of Commons and this house very generously votes the money to pay the higher salaries in the Senate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman make that statement. He takes the view taken by that great public servant, Sir John Bourinot, whose view was that when the House of Commons decided to appoint an officer, that officer should be ipso facto appointed. I advocated the same policy four years ago, but I was denied the privilege of appointing our own officers under the control of the House of Commons, as the matter should be.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Nothing can take away from the House of Commons the responsibility for passing estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER: Exactly.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If the Senate want to appoint a man to a position, it cannot do so until the money is voted by the House of Commons. There is a distinct discrimination and it does not reflect any credit upon this house to vote larger salaries for men holding certain positions in the Senate than are received by men holding similar positions in