

emoluments should seek re-election from his constituents. I do not know how any one would be injured if my suggestion were accepted.

We have had the statement from my right hon. friend that Sir George Perley is serving his country and accepting nothing for his services. We have it from my hon. friend from Queens and Shelburne (Mr. McCurdy) that he will not accept any emolument. Under these circumstances it seems to me that no harm would be done if the offices are created, but if the principle of re-election in the case of the acceptance of emoluments is adhered to. I share the view expressed the other day by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), and by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), that no one should be appointed to such responsible positions as those referred to in the present Bill without accepting the emoluments attached to the position. As it has been stated since, it is not right that public offices should be given to the millionaire class only. A man who accepts a position under the Crown on these conditions is likely to regard himself as his own master, whilst the spirit of British institutions is that a public officer, a minister of the Crown, is not his own master but is the servant of the people and of the Crown. I most strenuously object to the appointment of millionaires who will refuse to accept the emoluments, not because I do not admire their magnanimity, but because it is against the best interests of the country that positions or offices should be given to the wealthy only—who sometimes may not be the best choice—and should not be given to the men of ordinary means who may have the desire and ambition to serve King and country.

These are my objections to this proposal. I am not at all criticising the measure with reference to personalities. The gentlemen who are being selected under the new Bill as overseas minister and as under secretaries are personal friends of mine. Although I do not believe that Sir George Perley was the best choice of the Government yet, personally, as he is a friend of mine, I am very glad to see him where he is. But we should not, because of personal friendship, depart from the principle of the British constitution, namely, that any one receiving emolument under the Crown, as a minister or under secretary, should meet his electors.

In the case of Sir George Perley, it is remarkable that he was elected in 1911 and was selected by my right hon. friend to be minister without portfolio representing the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec. Immediately afterwards, upon the death of Lord Strathcona he went to England and assumed there the office of High Commissioner for Canada. Meanwhile he came back to Canada and on different occasions replaced the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) temporarily

We hardly see him in the House, and certainly his electors do not see him. Since that time he returned to England, where he discharged the duties of High Commissioner, and he has now been made Overseas Minister of Militia and Defence, and the country has seen absolutely nothing of him. Somebody must speak for his electors in this matter. I have had occasion to meet the electors of the county of Argenteuil within the last few months. An opponent has been selected in the person of Mr. McGibbon, a farmer of Argenteuil. The term of Parliament has expired, and we have given an extension of one year. Surely it is not during that year of extension that we shall give Sir George Perley an appointment with emoluments, and at the same time allow him to receive such emoluments without going before his electors. I say in all sincerity and in all earnestness that this is going too far and that the people of the country will resent that treatment. I do not see why, because we are at war, Sir George Perley should not come back to Canada and face his electors. What objection is there to that procedure? Further, he may not come back at all. The county may be opened to-morrow, and it would be as easy to proceed with an election there as it will be to proceed with one vote of the soldiers at the next general election.

I repeat that it is a great mistake, and it is an encroachment on the rights of the people to allow a new minister of the Crown or an under-secretary who will receive emoluments to accept such an office without appearing before his electors. As the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said the other day, it is true that in England, when the present Government was reorganized, for a certain determined period of time the old practice was suspended. But we have seen of late new ministers selected by the Prime Minister of England, men of great reputation