

The SPEAKER—That is as to clerks. This is as to messengers.

Hon. Mr. POWER—This is with respect to the next one—

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT—I should like to draw the attention of the House to what seems to me to be hardly consistent with the importance of the Senate and with its dignity, that the Order Paper should be loaded down with three orders of the very small importance of the last three items on the order paper. Order No. 3 reads as follows:

Consideration of the Memorandum from the Speaker of the Senate recommending the appointment of two pages.—(Hon. Mr. Watson.)

Order No. 4 is:

Consideration of the Memorandum from the Speaker of the Senate recommending the appointment of a sessional clerk in the Law Clerk's office.—(Hon. Mr. Watson.)

Then we have order No. 5 which reads:

Consideration of the Memorandum from the Speaker of the Senate recommending the appointment of a sessional messenger.—(Hon. Mr. Watson.)

That this high and important body should be expected to deliver itself solemnly and separately on three very small matters of this kind seems to me hardly to be consistent with the dignity and importance of the Senate. I hope some means will be found by which these matters of detail shall be left in the hands of the Speaker. I think the appointment of pages, messengers and sessional clerks, and all minor employees of that kind, should not be made the subject of debate in this House. Under section 45 we might very well adopt a general resolution which would enable the Speaker to deal finally with these matters. If that section were carried out literally, I suppose every time a page was appointed a resolution of this House would be required to sanction the appointment. What would seem to be more consonant with the dignity of this House would be the adoption of a general resolution which would place in the hands of our Speaker the appointment of

Hon. Mr. POWER.

these minor officials. I could quite understand when we are dealing with the higher positions, such as the clerk and the assistant clerk, the House might be very reluctant to debar itself of the power of consultation, but when it comes to messengers and packers one would think it would be very much more consonant with the dignity of the Senate that it should be left to the Speaker. I cannot make a motion now, but as one of the younger members I may be permitted to make the suggestion so that it may be dealt with at a future time.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Could we by a simple resolution override the law?

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT—If my hon. friend will follow closely he will see that it can be dealt with by a general resolution. Section 45 reads:

Wherever under sections 5, 8, 10, and other sections mentioned there, any action is authorized or directed to be taken by the Governor in Council or order in council, such action with respect to the officers, clerks or employees of the House of Commons or the Senate shall be taken by the House of Commons or the Senate as the case may be, by resolution.

If we can deal with that individually, why cannot we deal with it collectively, and pass a general resolution authorizing the Speaker to deal with these matters as they occur?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The memo. instead of being for one case would be for three cases.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT—Yes, we would deal with them collectively.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—That would be more dignified.

The SPEAKER—The difficulty is that these appointments were made at different times. The copy of the letter sent by Wm. Foran, secretary of the Civil Service Commission, to the clerk of the Senate reads as follows:

January 18, 1909.

Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of this date, requesting the issue of certificates of qualification in favour of Clifford Russell and