

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it the intention that copies of the lists of electors shall be supplied to the Electoral Officer as they are now furnished to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, they will come to the Chief Electoral Officer.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Subsections (a) (b) (c) (d) and (e) refer to the duties that formerly devolved upon the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. If that is so what is it proposed to do with that officer when the Bill has passed?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know that I can tell exactly what they will do with him. I believe he is entitled now to some consideration by way of superannuation. I suppose that is a matter to be considered in the future. By this Bill we are going to abolish the office, and I have no doubt the Government will find some way of dealing with the situation.

Mr. CURRIE: I would like to say something in connection with this appointment—

The CHAIRMAN: The appointment of the Chief Electoral Officer?

Mr. CURRIE: No, I am referring to the clause under discussion whereby it is proposed to have the Parliamentary Counsel appointed as Chief Electoral Officer. It is not many months since the Government saw fit to dispense with the services of the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel and appoint another. Suppose the same condition should exist in a year or two or at any time; how can you allow this same person to carry a life appointment in another department of the Government? I think that is something that the Government ought to consider before they ask this House to pass such a clause. The Parliamentary Counsel can be removed by resolution after the passing of the Act—The Law Clerk was removed; he is still quite a young man. This Bill says that the Parliamentary Counsel, who is appointed during pleasure shall be appointed for a life term as Chief Electoral Officer. Suppose the Parliamentary Council is removed, what happens to the Chief Electoral Officer? This should be considered before the clause is adopted in its finality. I wish to express my strong objection to the appointment of any of the officers of this House for life. You are only setting up a form of Prussianism when you are appointing officers for life. You will very soon find that these officers will consider themselves to be above the House of Commons and we will have

no control over them whatever. The Ontario Government, in the goodness of its heart, appointed certain officers for life and now it finds that it cannot do anything with them. The Law Society in Ontario memorialized the Government to do certain things to these officers but these officers sit back, laugh and say: You cannot remove us; we are the same as judges. It is an undemocratic principle to appoint any man to any office for life.

Mr. JACOBS: Even judges?

Mr. CURRIE: Even judges. In the United States judges are elected by the people, and we do not find any great desire there to have them appointed for life. It is the same with officers of this kind. Very many of the officers who are appointed for life ought to be in the asylum. The Government should take cognizance of these things when they ask this House to swallow the appointment of any person for life. It is enough that we have to appoint judges without having to appoint other officers of the Crown for life. I trust the Minister will see to it that this clause is considered further, because this officer is going to hold a dual position. It is anomalous that a subsidiary or junior officer of this House should be the Chief Electoral Officer. I could understand the Clerk being appointed Chief Officer but not the legal officer of the House. I think the clause should stand.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Before any answer is given to the hon. gentleman, I must point out that we are still upon clause 18 which has nothing to do with the appointment of the Chief Electoral Officer.

Mr. CAHILL: If you do away with the present officer you will have no officer if clause 19 does not carry. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is quite in order when he asks to have this clause stand.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has only decided that the recent discussion is not relevant to clause 18. If the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) wishes to take exception to that ruling, his proper recourse is to appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CAHILL: Well I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CURRIE: You called me to order, Mr. Chairman, but you did not call the rest of the members to order and the minister was proceeding to answer. It hap-