our people have. They do not sit so late, and the messengers, pages—every person connected with the House of Commons is much harder worked, and is obliged to work for longer hours and for a greater number of days in the year during the Session, and after prorogation, than the corresponding officers of the Senate.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I am sorry that the hon. gentleman has not some control over his colleagues in the Government in the other end, so that he might exercise some control over the salaries which are paid in the Senate. For instance, their Assistant Clerk get, \$2,800; our Assistant, \$2,400. I notice to, that although their hours are so short, their Sergeant at-Arms gets \$1,200, and the deputy, whose duties were so onerous that his salary had to be increased by \$100, receives \$1,000. The Postmaster, whose duties are not, I should think, very onerous, gets an increase of \$200, and if I am not misinformed he also keeps a small dry goods store in one corner of the Post Office for the accommodation of hon, members of the Senate. The housekeeper, whose duties are not very laborious, one would say, also gets an increase of \$200, and why the Speaker's messenger should receive an addition of \$100 to his salary I cannot see. If I remember rightly the utterances of the present Speaker of the Senate, I should suppose he was an exceedingly economical man. I think he once said that the expenditure of the various Departments of this Government were as much under the control of the Minister as were his household expenses, but here we find the salary of his own messenger increased by \$100. This officer must be under his control to a certain extent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not suppose he is.

Mr. ROSS. He is the Speaker's messenger; there can be no doubt about it. Then the Senators themselves, whose time is not spent very steadily in their Chamber, must have an additional messenger at a salary of \$800. I was inquisitive enough to enquire how hard these Senators have worked during the present Session, and I found that since the House met they have sat thirty-two days. We met on Thursday, February 8th, and the Senate adjourned, after an hour's sitting, to the following Monday, and on that day they sat for three hours. Since the Senate began its duties, their sittings have averaged about one and a-half hours a day. They adjourned over the Ontario Elections-why, I cannot say; and, if I am not mistaken, some of the hon. members of the Senate, during that contest, entered into the political arena. I think one distinguished Senator visited the city of Brantford, and did yeoman service for the Conservative party. do not know, but, perhaps, he is non-political—perhaps he did not speak in favor of the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature—but he certainly took part in the election. Another Senator visited the county of Huron, and in order to make it convenient for them to go on these political peregrinations the whole business of the Senate must be stopped, forsooth, in order that they might take part in a political contest. After the Elections they came back and worked for fourteen days, then they adjourned over Easter for nearly two weeks; and so exhaustive were their labors during the Ontario Elections that when they met on the 1st of March, after the contest, they remained in Session for exactly ten minutes, no doubt being completely worn out with the duties they were discharging for the people of the country. More than that; I think the present Speaker of the Senate argued in 1878 that Canada should be kept for the Canadians. But, if I am not wrongly informed, that hon gentleman sat for his portrait, not before a Canadian artist, but before an Old Country artist, and, under the vivid imagination of the painter, the picture assumed such herculean proportions that no place in the corridors or the lobbies of these buildings, or in the Departments, is capacious enough in the Speaker's own room. Now, why should we expend ings, at five dollars a head." That is just the spirit in which Sir John A. Maddonald.

\$489 on a portrait which is to be excluded from the vulgar public gaze and to be hidden away in the Speaker's room, where it can be viewed only by those who have the entree to his chamber? I would ask further: Why did not that distinguished gentleman engage a Canadian artist, as is done in the case of Speakers' portraits generally? Our ex-Speaker, a most presentable man anywhere, had his portrait painted by a Canadian artist, and it cost \$100 less than the other. The artist was a Canadian artist. That was encouraging a Canadian industry—a very desirable one. But hon, gentlemen opposite, represented by the Speaker of the Senate, and a member of the Government, could not encourage this native industry; he, forsooth, could not submit to this indignity of having his features preserved for posterity by a Canadian artist, but he must seek for a foreigner. Is this fair? I fancy that this and other items which I need not enumerate, account for a portion of this increase. I think we should not only express our dissatisfaction with this particular act of the Speaker of the Senate, but that we should express strongest terms our disapprobation of jn members of the Senate interfering in Provincial Elections. I think it is not their place to do it. In England, the members of the House of Lords do not interfere with the Elections for the Commons. True, this was not for the Commons; but Senators occupy, or claim to occupy, a judicial position, and to be in an atmosphere above that of ordinary party warfare. Now, what will be the effect on the community of these Senators entering the political arena, and giving the weight of their senatorial positions to the statements they make. I think it is entirely wrong, and I for one cannot express too strongly or too plainly my disapprobation of that course, and I hope that that expression, even from so humble a member as myself, will have its weight with the Senate. If they play the part of partisans, and engage in the party struggles of the day, as we know some of them have done, what confidence can we have in their judgment in the Senate? We shall have to regard Senators as marked with the same stripe as members of the Commons; if the Senate is to occupy in the country a non-partisan position we want these Senators to abstain from interfering in the Local Elections, and I hope this expression of opinion will, as I have said, have its due weight.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have rather strayed away from the vote here before the House. This is a vote for the salaries and contingencies of the Senate, and I think if Dr. Playfair had been in your position, Mr. Chairman, he would have called the hon, gentleman to order for straying away so far from the subject before us. I will leave the Senate to read the amusing speech and badinage of the hon. gentleman opposite; but when he speaks of the present Speaker of the Sonate, my colleague, the hon. Mr. Mac-pherson, I am quite satisfied that he is as economically inclined in every possible way as the hon. gentleman opposite. One of the messengers is detailed to attend to the Speaker's room, but the Speaker has no more to do with his salary than with that of any other messenger. It is fixed by the Committee on Contingencies, and if the hon. gentleman had been behind the door when these matters were discussed—I was not there—but I have no doubt he would have heard the Speaker contend for economy, and perhaps speak against some of these increases. I am quite surprised that the hon. gentleman, who is a man of letters, a man of classical knowledge, as he showed the other day, a man trained to the humane arts, should go out of his way to object to any gentleman sitting for his portrait to the portrait painter he fancies. The hon, gentleman's objection is quite in the style of Sam Slick, who said: "I went to Italy and I saw old smoked, dried-up pictures there that were worth five or six thousand dollars; why I can get new