

the three trustees, I believe the government should have power to fill the vacancies. If on the other hand the three are appointed from a panel, which I believe restricts the class from which they can be drawn, then in my view further appointments should be made in the same way.

Mr. MANION: In view of the opinions expressed from all sections of the house the government has decided to accept the suggestion of doing away with the panel. Unfortunately the amendment as moved by the hon. member for Quebec South does not fill the bill because, no doubt unintentionally, he moved that the whole clause after the word "occurring" be stricken out. Since the hon. member is not here to withdraw the amendment I shall have to ask the committee to vote it down, and then I will have an amendment moved simply striking out the words after the word "occurring" to the end of the sub-clause.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the way the amendment reads now, to strike out all the remaining words in the section.

Mr. MANION: Yes, but that means all of section 6.

Amendment (Mr. Power) negatived.

Mr. MANION: Then I have this amendment.

Mr. BENNETT: I move that all the words after the word "occurring" in subsection 1 of section 6 be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 7—Removal from office or reduction of salary.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This section reads:

No trustee shall be removed from office, nor suffer any reduction in salary, during the term for which he is appointed, unless for assigned cause and on address of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada.

We have just decided, I think unanimously, that in the matter of the appointment of trustees the doctrine of ministerial responsibility should be observed and maintained. I would submit that all that can be said in favour of maintaining that doctrine with respect to appointments ought to apply equally with respect to the continuance in office of trustees and with respect to their salaries. I think this clause ought to be struck out altogether on that ground, without mentioning other reasons that might be equally strong, if not stronger.

Mr. MANION: We held this section in abeyance, and it has been fully discussed by the government. We are of the opinion that this clause should stand as it is at present. I think the best arguments that can be advanced in favour of this provision were advanced when the section was first under consideration. They were to this effect, that if one or all of the trustees proved unworthy or unfit to fill these positions there is no doubt that the other chamber, whatever might be its composition, would be glad to help get rid of them. On the other hand if it should so happen that any government—and I do not refer particularly to the government of my right hon. friend opposite—for any unfair or unwise reason should desire to get rid of trustees who had been doing excellent work, it would be only right that the other chamber should refuse to permit that action to be taken. I do not submit this argument in criticism of any party or any group; I simply say that if such a situation should occur we ought to have that safeguard. I believe the House of Commons can feel sure that if these trustees, or any of them, should be unfit to carry on or should in some way betray their trust, both chambers of this parliament would be glad to act in unison to get rid of them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What the minister has just said is the equivalent of saying that one branch of parliament should be supreme as against the ministry itself, which itself is responsible to parliament as a whole and through parliament to the people; moreover the particular branch of parliament which the minister mentions is the branch which has not the immediate responsibility to the people that the elected chamber has. I do not see why it should be necessary for any minister of the crown to reflect upon a government as such, and that is what is being done in this paragraph and even in the words used by the minister this afternoon.

Mr. MANION: I did not reflect on any government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister's words were an implication, if not a reflection; he referred to any government that might be in office and that might want to do something that was not right and proper. Since when did one administration become the keeper of the conscience of its successor? I submit that so long as we have responsible government we must assume that the government which is placed in office by the people will be actuated by fair and honourable motives, and we must give that government a free hand.