

the Crown should devote his attention carefully, I may say exclusively, it is that of Minister of Railways, at the present time. Now, Sir, what is the hon. gentleman's position? He was appointed on the 1st of June last to the office of High Commissioner; he left during the month for London, and he remained until December. All this time he was a Minister of the Crown. Who discharged his duties as Minister of Railways? It is as Minister of Railways that he holds a statutory office, just as he does in the other case; and in that office there are certain duties devolving upon him. He has received from the Governor General a patent for the discharge of the duties of that office. Under the law, no one else can take charge of those duties. We know, as a matter of practice, however, that one Minister does, in a perfunctory way, undertake the duties of another Minister; but it is impossible to suppose that a Minister having his own duties to discharge can attend to the duties of another Minister, and discharge the duties of his own office at the same time. The Minister of Railways placed the Minister of Agriculture in charge of his office while he was away. I maintain that he alone could not perform those duties which he was called on to perform under his patent as Minister of Railways. But the hon. gentleman who acted in his place had other duties devolving upon him as Minister of Agriculture—duties quite adequate to his ability as a Minister, duties that will require all his time in order that they may be discharged efficiently. There are the subjects of immigration and agriculture and statistics; we know that the volumes of statistics that ought to have been in the possession of the country months ago, are not yet in its possession, and we know that the hon. gentleman has so divided his attention between the duties of his own Department and those of the Minister of Railways, that volumes are submitted to this House, to which I shall call attention on another occasion, which are utterly worthless, which show that the duties have not been properly discharged, and that the subjects have not fairly occupied the attention of the hon. Minister. For if they had, they would not have been presented to Parliament in the way they have. No matter how that may be, it is obvious that the hon. Minister of Agriculture was not in a position properly to discharge the work of the hon. Minister of Railways. Look at the important questions that came up in the absence of the Minister of Railways. One question came up relating to a railway in the Eastern Townships, upon which the acting Minister was called on to make a report, and he did make a report; it was a matter in which he was personally interested. Was he in a position fairly to present that subject to his colleagues? Was he in a position to give his colleagues an impartial report on the subject? Was he in the position in which the hon. Minister of Railways would have been, had he been in the country at the time? Then there was the subject of the railway guarantee. We know how that was bungled. I am not going to enter into a discussion now on that matter, as that was fully discussed at an earlier period, but it is perfectly obvious that it could not have fully occupied the mind of, or have been carefully considered by, the acting Minister of Railways. It is perfectly clear to everyone who has looked at what was done, that if the Minister himself, who is responsible for that Department, had been here, what was done would probably not have been done, under the circumstances. Then there is the question of the general oversight of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman knows he is responsible to the country, he knows that the country holds him responsible for the general oversight of the Canadian Pacific Railway; he knows that he asked Parliament to grant that Company a large amount of money, and a large extent of territory, and it is part of his duty, as a Minister, to see that that subsidy is not misapplied, to see that it is not wasted, to see that the purpose for which it was granted has been fully

carried out. Has the hon. Minister been here for the purpose of looking after the affairs of his Department? Has he undertaken to discharge those duties that Parliament requires at his hands, and that the country looks to him to perform? Not at all; the hon. gentleman has been elsewhere; he has been looking after affairs connected with the Department of Agriculture; he has been looking after the condition of cattle that were landed at Liverpool, discharging the work that devolves upon an ordinary veterinary officer and seeking to take credit to himself for duties that could quite as well, perhaps better, have been performed by some cattle doctor occupying a very subordinate position. When we look at the facts, we will see that the hon. Minister of Railways has not discharged his duties. In the first place, he is not a resident High Commissioner; he has not become a permanent resident of London; he has not carried out the policy of the Act providing for a permanent Agent of the Government of Canada at the Capital of the Empire. The hon. gentleman also knows that in taking that position he took an office wholly incompatible with his office as Minister of Railways. He knows that as Minister of Railways he stands on a footing of equality with his colleagues, the Ministers of Agriculture and Finance; he knows that as High Commissioner he is subordinate to both—in regard to some matters with one, and in regard to other matters with the other. He knows that in withdrawing from Canada he has been half his year in London—the half year in which it was of least consequence to the country that he should be there, and during that time he neglected his duty as Minister of Railways. He has not exercised that supervision over the office it was necessary he should exercise, especially when so large an amount of money has been placed by the country at the disposal of the Canadian Pacific Railway and over which he is bound to exercise an official oversight. It is true we are told the whole Government are responsible for the work of each Department, but as a matter of fact that is not the case. We know that each Minister is responsible for the work of his own Department; we do not hold one Minister responsible for the failures and incapacity or negligence of another. In order that we may have a proper and efficient responsibility in this country, where our administrative work is to so large a degree departmental, it is necessary each Minister should be held individually responsible for the work of his own Department; and it is perfectly obvious that the business of the Department during an important part of the year has not been under the supervision of the Minister who was placed in charge—who has received a patent from the Crown for the purpose of discharging the duties of that office. The hon. gentleman knows that during the six months or more that he was in London, it was utterly impossible that he should exercise over the Department that control it required, and this being the case, I hold that the position which the hon. gentleman has occupied as Minister of Railways is one that is wholly incompatible with the position which he holds as High Commissioner to the United Kingdom. Such being the case, I beg leave to move the following Resolution—to leave out all the words after "That," and insert the following:—

"The Act creating the office of a resident Commissioner and Agent for Canada in the United Kingdom, recites that it is expedient that Canada should have a resident representative Agent in the United Kingdom, to watch over her interests, to be duly accredited to the Imperial Government, and it enacts that such officer shall hold office during pleasure, shall act as representative and resident Agent of the Dominion in the United Kingdom, and shall, in that capacity discharge such duties as shall be assigned to him, and shall carry out such instructions as shall be given by the Governor in Council, and shall take charge of the immigration offices and agencies in the United Kingdom, under the Minister of Agriculture; that in June, 1883, Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways and Canals and member for Cumberland, was appointed High Commissioner, retaining his office of Minister of Railways and Canals and the salary of \$7,000 a year, and receiving the allowance of \$4,000 a year voted in respect of the office of High Commissioner; that in June, 1883, Sir