

ing an autocracy by the simple dictum of the Cabinet of Canada? Appoint him to some position. If it is essential that a good officer should be appointed, let General Turner have the position. He is a good officer, and every one has confidence in him. Let him act as an officer under the present Minister of Militia in Canada, and you will find much more harmony and much more execution, the soldiers will be better looked after, and there will be much more satisfaction throughout. In reference to the question of "no pay", I do not wish to bring in the personal matter, but I may say I was more or less surprised at my good friend the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. McCurdy), bringing up the matter in the House, and saying he was not going to take pay. Lord Strathcona represented the country for many years and did not accept pay, but he did not advertise it from the housetops.

Mr. BENNETT: The cheques for his salary were all paid after he died.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am glad to hear they were paid. His executors did the proper thing. There was no advertising done about it. I presume the cheques were lying around, and some one picked them up for him, but I want to point out that when matters are brought up concerning this office overseas, people will say, "Oh, well now, do not say anything about it, because Sir George Perley is not taking pay for his work". That has been placarded from one end of Canada to the other. The consequence is that people feel called upon to say, "This gentleman has done something great for Canada in refusing to take his pay". Supposing his salary is \$10,000, a year, and he has been there five or six years, that would amount to \$50,000 or \$60,000.

I know a gentleman not far from the sound of my voice to-day, who is well informed in matters connected with this war, who will say that in one week this country lost ten times that amount through the maladministration of this gentleman. Yet we are debarred from exercising the control that we should exercise as members of this House and as followers of a party in power because, forsooth, he does not accept his salary. I hope that no gentleman in this House will ever make it a boast—I will not, at all events—that he is taking a job without salary, because if he did I should be somewhat suspicious that he was after a knighthood or something of that kind. Such gentlemen would be after something other than the welfare of the community.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

An hon. gentleman says that I do not think much of the knighthood. I do think a good deal of knighthood when it is earned. I want to see the gentleman in Canada who has in greater degree earned his knighthood than your humble servant has. When the Prime Minister replies, will he tell me whether this condition will exist only during the period of the war, or is it to be for all time? In other words, are we to keep this distinguished gentleman there? Why not make it a job that he shall have by divine right, or something of that kind?

Mr. GRAHAM: Is it hereditary?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes—is it hereditary? I have had a good deal to do with the appointing of officers to responsible positions during this war, and I challenge any one to show where personal friendship has been allowed to come in. Where personal friendship was involved as against an enemy, the ability in each case being equal, the gentleman who was my personal friend got recognition; I have no hesitation in saying that. But where personal friendship was the only recommendation, I challenge any one to find out where any such officer was recognized. On the contrary, unfortunately, I can point to cases where personal friends and gentlemen seeking to exercise personal friendship fought for positions and were denied them, enmity being thereby incurred. If Sir George Perley is to be kept overseas in his present position, certainly he will not be kept there on account of his worth; certainly he will not be kept there on account of the respect in which he is held by the soldiers. If he is kept there, it will be on account of personal friendship; and as an advocate of representative government I protest against this law being passed in his interest. If it is determined that he shall remain there, let him give up the position of minister of the Crown. Let us not violate the constitution. Let him accept the position as an officer of this Government in order that he may perform whatever duties appertain to the office; then his salary can be paid him and it will not be necessary to deface the statute-book of our country by passing a law of this kind.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I had not intended to speak on the second reading of this Bill until I heard the speech of the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). In his statement, as well as in answers received from the Government and from hon. gentlemen on the other side who have knowledge concerning