

work. I look upon a position in the service of the Senate as a sort of a prize, something which comes to very few people, and it is regarded as a prize. I think there is no reason why there should not be just a few of these small plums left for the small people, as well as the large plums for the big people, and I think, for the present session at any rate, we might treat these messengers as they have been treated in the past, and let them understand that hereafter their pay is liable to be reduced.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—I am somewhat surprised at the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Halifax, more particularly when he knows, as I read to the House, that we fixed the pay of the messengers of this House in 1891, so that none of them can be taken by surprise.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I stated that it was not understood as a rule.

Hon. Mr. O'DONOHUE—In this matter the salary having been for some fifteen years \$250 a session, I do not think it would be entirely right, because this session happens to be exceptionally short, to cut down the allowance. There was a reason for increasing it in 1891—a very good reason, as stated by the hon. member from Halifax. The session was so very long that it seemed only just to increase the rate. It is on an average session that the rate should be made and more particularly as it is in contemplation, in the early part of next session, to revise the list of salaries.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—But a sessional messenger is not a salaried officer—it is a per diem allowance.

Hon. Mr. O'DONOHUE—It is a sessional allowance, but, after all, it is *pro tanto* a salary—it is so much to these messengers. When for fourteen or fifteen years they have been in the habit of receiving \$250 per session as an allowance, it is not entirely fair to them to cut that down because this session happens to be exceptionally short. There is great force in what the leader of the House says about the settlement of 1891, but it must be remembered that the sessional employees of the House are not really met as an employer meets his employees making a bargain with them; they have just to take

what they get; it is a certain allowance that is set apart for them. They are not parties to the bargain, nor are they parties to the shortening of the session. If the session were only for thirty days instead of sixty days, according to the argument of my hon. friend, the leader of the Government, the pay would be cut down to the pay of thirty days, although it is well known that these sessional employees remain here free from other engagements in order to take upon themselves the duties of the House. I think the \$250, as that has been the rate for fifteen years in exceptionally long sessions, should be continued to them, particularly as it is intended next session to revise the allowances generally.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—I do not rise to oppose the amendment, but I could not let it pass without saying a few words. I recollect very well seven or eight years ago when I, as a member of this House, asked to amend the report of a committee, I was told by the leader of the Senate at that time that it was a serious matter to interfere with the report of a committee nominated by the House—that its reports should be accepted, unless some very grave and important reasons could be assigned for interfering with them. I regret to see the unanimity of the House in desiring to have this amendment at once carried. I would have been less surprised had it not, as I am told, been decided to increase the salaries of members this session—because it was shorter I suppose. I understand that the members of both Houses are to receive an allowance of six days extra.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—Not this House.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—I mean Parliament. This House has to vote the money, so my argument is perfectly good. The House of Commons could not get the increase without the vote of the Senate. Are we prepared to say that because of the shortness of the session members of the House of Commons must receive an increase of six days allowance, and that for the same reason the sessional messengers shall receive a little less? That is rather hard on our messengers. It is my custom to stand by the poor people and help them through their difficulties. We who are rich can take care of ourselves. The argument has been