

Mr. BENNETT: He cannot be.

Mr. STIRLING: What can he do?

Mr. BENNETT: The minister has said either too much or too little. He has said that Mr. Castonguay came to him since August 7, 1935, and pleaded with him to appoint an assistant.

Mr. RINFRET: I repeat that.

Mr. BENNETT: Then Mr. Castonguay is an active partisan, for during all the time the preceding government was in office he not only said there was no use for an assistant, but protested against the appointment of any such assistant. That shows that Mr. Castonguay is an active partisan and desired to hold that office open for a Liberal administration. That is a despicable act on his part, showing that he is unfit for a public office, when he reported to the former Secretary of State that an appointment should not be made and that he would not recommend it, and then pleads with the successor of the former Secretary of State to appoint an assistant, when the duties are less than they were at any time during the preceding five years. There has never been a more glaring case of the conduct of an official, indicating sheer partisanship and unfitness for his position, and it is one that should be remembered by this country.

Item agreed to.

Dominion franchise commissioner—salaries and contingencies of office, et cetera—further amount required, \$6,000.

Mr. HEAPS: There was another gentleman appointed to assist in the work of revising the elections act. I think everyone who was on that committee appreciated the work he did. How long was that gentleman in the employ of the government, or have his services now been dispensed with?

Mr. BENNETT: I had a note to ask what Mr. Butcher was being paid.

Mr. RINFRET: I understand he has now finished his work.

Mr. BENNETT: What was he being paid?

An hon. MEMBER: He was engaged by the committee of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: No; it was not any committee of the house; he was appointed by the administration, and I had a note to ask when the estimate was up why he was appointed and what salary he was paid.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He was retained in order to prepare material for the [Mr. Rinfret.]

committee. He worked with the committee while it was in session. I have not at hand the amount he was paid. My right hon. friend will appreciate the reason why I cannot give it at the moment.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is his work finished, or is he still in the employ of the government?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No; I understand his work was finished some days or weeks ago.

Item agreed to.

Mr. CAHAN: On item No. 221 of the general estimates my hon. friend the Secretary of State said there was an assistant to the dominion franchise commissioner. Who is he and when was he appointed?

Mr. RINFRET: I have that before me. Mr. Minns is his name, and I understand he was appointed at the same time as the commissioner himself.

Mr. CAHAN: I accept that, but I do not think he was appointed as a permanent assistant; he was seconded from another office to assist temporarily when the heavy work of the revision of the lists was on.

Mr. RINFRET: Lieutenant-Colonel E. H. Minns is the name, and he is paid \$2,964. I might say he is still with the office. When I communicate with that office he usually replies.

Mr. CAHAN: Quite so.

Mr. RINFRET: I think it was a very good appointment, and he is an efficient man.

Mr. CAHAN: I am not discussing his appointment, at all. The minister justified the appointment of an assistant—

Mr. RINFRET: I said there was an analogy.

Mr. CAHAN: Yes; an analogy. But there was no assistant appointed permanently to assist the franchise commissioner, if my memory is correct. There was seconded from another department a Mr. Minns to assist, but only while the preparation of the lists was on. No permanent appointment has been made. I could have recommended the permanent appointment of an assistant, but there was no necessity for a permanent appointment. So far as my memory goes no permanent appointment was made; an officer was loaned from another department to act temporarily.