

paign literature. I think that will not be of assistance in helping this Bill through. I think if the people of the country believe what the member for Bruce really intimates they might believe, that is that he does prepare such literature, they will form their own opinions.

Mr. HUGH CLARK (North Bruce): May I repeat what I have already said, that if that was the principle business for which I was appointed, I have been neglecting my duty.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is left-handed.

Mr. GRAHAM: The House can take their own viewpoint. The hon. member declines to say that he has not prepared campaign literature or written articles since he became parliamentary secretary. That being the case, I ask the Prime Minister if he thinks it quite fair to ask us to pass a retroactive measure granting a salary from last October to a member who tacitly admits that he has been engaged since that time in preparing campaign literature. I leave it at that.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: May I ask the hon. gentleman if he would, on his word of honour, say that during his incumbency as Minister of Railways and Canals he never wrote anything for the Brockville Recorder or any other paper?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not for the world say that, and I would not question the propriety of the hon. member for Bruce writing anything for the Kincardine Review, for which he would be paid by the Kincardine Review, and not by the country.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And you went before your electors when you were made minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: I went before my electors when I was appointed minister. I did not ask to be exempted by statute. This legislation does not say that from this time on gentlemen who are receiving emoluments from the Crown shall be exempt from the constitutional requirement of re-election, but in proposing it the Government asks the House to vote that these three gentlemen, having been appointed to office months ago, shall have salary paid to them, in violation of the constitution, dating back to October last. The Government is acting like an autocratic head of a railway who first decides what will be done and then asks the directors to sanction what the head has proposed. This Government takes a

[Mr. Graham.]

step in direct violation of our constitution and then, nearly a year afterwards, asks Parliament to approve of that violation. For the life of me, I do not see what justification the Government has for this position. The hon. gentleman from Calgary said: "What difference does it make, because there is shortly to be an election." It makes a difference of more than a year, because this Bill proposes that these gentlemen shall receive salary for a year before there will be a general election, and before Parliament has been asked to sanction this contract.

If the Government is going to propose, merely because there is a war on, that every vestige of responsible Government can be set aside whenever they wish to set it aside, I think it is a mistaken idea, and it was too bad we did not have a general election a year ago, instead of an extension of the parliamentary term. Had Parliament ever thought the Government would openly violate what has been the constitution of Canada for many years, I believe the extension would not have been granted. I think members on both sides of the House would have objected to it. I am not criticising the two parliamentary secretaries at all, because they are both competent for the position, but one of them spends some of his time in doing work for his party and the country is asked to pay for that time. The other gentleman says he will not take the salary. I do not believe in that kind of stuff at all. I am not reflecting on the hon. gentleman from Shelburne and Queens for an instant, because I believe he wishes to give his services and does not want remuneration, but in a country like ours you cannot make those distinctions. If men wish to come forward and perform some great duty for the State, all right, but where it is an appointment such as that under discussion, it merely puts a premium on a man's bank account, and I submit that it places other gentlemen in a position they should not be placed in, because they are not financially able to work without remuneration. While I admire any man who is willing to serve his country for nothing, still it places us in the position that we do not feel at liberty to criticise a man who works for nothing as we would a public servant who is taking his pay. Time after time, when we have discussed things which took place overseas, we have been met with the statement: Sir George Perley is giving his services for nothing. Without criticising Sir George Perley unduly, we know that a man might be giving his services for nothing, and still be