

necessary, according to the statement of the ex-minister. He told us some days ago that a staff of 50 men were doing the work prior to Sir George Perley's appointment, and that that number has since been increased to 1,200. No explanation has been given of that enormous increase. We have had no explanation of the reckless character of this gentleman who is our Overseas Minister. Before the Bill passes we should have a full statement of the names of all the officials appointed by the Overseas Minister, with the salary paid to each. That makes the Bill a serious one.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not go into details of the matter, but by establishing a new ministry overseas all the offices here, such as that of deputy minister, Quarter-master General, and so on, have been duplicated, and so these extra people have been employed. That is owing to the existence of the office.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That means a very serious additional expense to the country. The duties of an officer overseas would seem to be of a military character; the direction of civil affairs in connection with the war comes from this side. The Prime Minister has told us that the Minister Overseas has not power to make appointments, and that anything of special importance is referred to the Government. The Prime Minister has not explained why he has decided to ignore the constitution. The fact that it is inconvenient for Sir George Perley to cross the Atlantic to run an election is not a sufficient reason. We have 14 or 15 other ministers who could represent Sir George Perley in his constituency. The candidate does not need to be present. The Prime Minister has not explained why the under-secretaries do not appeal to the electors for ratification. Even if it would be inconvenient for Sir George Perley, it would not be for the under-secretaries, and the House should have a fuller explanation when we are asked to take an important departure and to violate the usual election law and the constitution. The Prime Minister has given no reason for the under-secretaries not being re-elected.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Parliamentary Counsel informs me that in Great Britain the parliamentary secretaries do not have to go up for re-election. In this case, and especially during the war, I thought it desirable to insert this clause for greater precaution, particularly as our statute is not in precisely the same language as the British statute.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do they get any salary in England?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are not ministers of the Crown, are they?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are. The distinction in Great Britain is that they are supposed to be appointed by the minister under whom they serve, and therefore, not being appointed by the Crown, they do not have to go back for re-election because they do not hold offices of emolument in the technical sense required by the British statute.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Our parliamentary secretaries are appointed by the Crown, and are made ministers of the Crown. It is a departure which I think is not a wise one, nor is it justified by the condition. I do not think the Prime Minister should be so frightened of the electors as to take such a course as this. I do not think it will be popular in the country. The fact that the under-secretary in Great Britain is appointed by the minister may be a reason why he should not have to appeal to the electors. But we are here introducing a new system, and I do not say it is a bad system. Both sides have on various occasions discussed this question, and it has met with a good deal of approval. But, now that we are embarking on it, I think we should follow the constitution, and require under-secretaries, appointed by the Crown to hold the position of minister of the Crown, to go to their electors.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are making a temporary arrangement, to last only during the war, and I thought, under war conditions, it was a very proper proposal to lay before Parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As a corollary of this, the Solicitor General was obliged to go before the electors, and he was not then a member of the Cabinet. He was in receipt of the same emolument as the under-secretaries will receive, and yet he was obliged to seek re-election.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The statute requires it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why not in this case?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have explained that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me that, before the House is asked to pass the section providing for the salaries of overseas ministers, the Prime Minister owes it to the