

an example of two gentlemen, one of whom has retired and is drawing his superannuation right along and another man who has been appointed and is drawing the same salary, so that we are paying two salaries. I would suggest paying this gentleman enough, if that be \$20,000 a year, but do not have any superannuation.

Mr. MORPHY: I quite appreciate the view of my hon. friend, but I think he is on the wrong basis. It seems to me that the main thing to be aimed at in this particular employee is fixity of tenure of office. The point of paying a man \$20,000 to avoid the principle of what my hon. friend calls "superannuation" does not apply in this case. In a position of this kind, if the gentleman lives to an age that would entitle a judge to a retiring allowance, it is only reasonable that the country, having paid for his services in the same way as for the services of a judge, should follow the same principle in regard to retiring allowance. I have no doubt that, unless we secure a man who is competent and who is prepared to devote his every energy to the work, we shall get into the same state as the country was in at the last general election. I think hon. members will find their experience was the same as my own, that that Election Act was in a state of chaotic jumble. There is no question about that, and I had to make many inquiries, being unable to solve many of the sections myself. I felt it would have been a great convenience if we had had a central authority, similar to the proposition now before the committee, to whom the candidates throughout the Dominion could have applied by wire and received in return a quick response by wire from a man who had organized the staff, who had studied the law, who had mastered all the details, who has a pre-eminent ability to construe sections of the Act. That would have saved the country a great deal of heart-burning and trouble, and it would have been better for the Government if they had had a really expert man at the head of proceedings at that time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: All the experts were in England.

Mr. MORPHY: Yes, by the way, Colonel Oliver Mowat Biggar was in England doing his bit, as I understand, in the country's interest in the Great War. I should not think that would be anything to his discredit. I believe the principle involved in this is sound. It may be said,

as the hon. member intimated, that the salary is large.

Mr. BEST: I did not say that the salary was large; I spoke about the superannuation.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman will give \$20,000 a year instead of \$10,000 in order to get rid of the superannuation.

Mr. BEST: I did not say that. I said "if it was necessary".

Mr. MORPHY: There was a string to it, a qualification.

Mr. BEST: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: To my mind, if the hon. gentleman meant that, it would cost this country a very large sum to capitalize \$20,000 a year if this gentleman should live long enough to entitle him to a retiring allowance at the end of his tenure of office.

As regards the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) I have made some inquiries about Colonel Biggar and I have never heard anything derogatory to him. I have never heard that he was a partisan, nor that he took active part in elections, and as this Act is intended to be a non-partisan Act, a fair Act for all parties in this country, the logical thing to do is to put a non-partisan into the position. I think Colonel Biggar is such a man. I do not think it is fair to assume a man is partisan because he happens to be called Oliver Mowat Biggar. The name is an honourable one.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The name sounds good.

Mr. MORPHY: It was a name with which men used often to conjure, and as we have in the seats of the Liberal-Unionists on this side a gentleman named Mowat who is a nephew of the late Hon. Oliver Mowat, and whom my hon. friend (Mr. Fripp) is content to sit with, surely he can extend the same courtesy and consideration to a gentleman who bears the same name as an hon. member who sits on the same side of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He will be a judge before long.

Mr. BEST: I did not state that I was opposed to a Chief Electoral Officer being appointed; I believe that is the proper thing to do, and I have no fault to find with the man whose name has been mentioned. If the hon. member for Perth North (Mr. Morphy) is referring to the last provincial election in Ontario, then he has a good idea of what has happened in regard to