

Hon. Mr. Davey: I was wondering whether Senator Walker has comparable figures for the Ontario government.

Hon. Mr. Walker: I would be glad to get them for you. I think by comparison it would be an informative lesson in how to govern well with few members.

This bill will permit of a cabinet of 28, with a further 10 ministers of state if they want them. There can be any number of ministers of state; there is no limit to their number. I could not understand from the bill how many there might be, so I asked my friend the former Leader of the Government, Senator Connolly, who admits that there is no limit. The bill will permit of 56 parliamentary secretaries, 28 for each two-year period; two Assistant Speakers, one for each two-year period. With the chairmen of committees, and so on, there are 136 members of the Government party who under this bill could have a job in the four-year period. In other words, nearly everyone would have an extra job, 138 out of 155. You and I should be back there as backbenchers, Senator Croll. This is really something.

Let us compare Canada with England in this respect. I ask honourable senators to keep in mind that Canada has a federal Government, with ten provincial governments doing all the rest of the work, plus two territorial governments. In England, which has only one Parliament, with below that the county councils, but no provincial governments, what do we find? There are 20 members of the cabinet, including the Prime Minister, with 30 ministers not in the cabinet, for a population of 50 million. The ministers not in the cabinet are ministers of state, who cannot speak on policy and can answer questions only on the activities of their own departments. In addition, there are law officers and so on. England, with no provincial or other governments, but one overall government, has only 20 members of the cabinet and 30 ministers who are not in the cabinet.

Australia, which is not quite as large as Canada but is a very important country, has a commonsense government, of which they are justly proud. They have 12 ministers in the cabinet; 14 ministers not in the cabinet; that is, 26 ministers in all. Twenty-one ministers are from the house of 125 members, and 5 ministers are from the Senate of 60 members. One could go on.

The United States has a cabinet of 12 members, not chosen from the house or the Senate, but appointed by the President; and, of course, 50 state governments.

France has a cabinet of 19 members, out of the national assembly of 779 members, and no provincial and no state governments.

Germany has a cabinet of 16 members. They have a federal diet which is composed of 496 members, but there are also provincial governments.

Japan, which is forging ahead so quickly in our new post-war world, has a cabinet of 21 members, with a House of Representatives of 467 members, with no provincial governments.

Honourable senators, why does Canada need this great proliferation of ministers of state? We have been given

no reasons. If there had been any reasons, Senator Connolly would have been able to expound on them, as he never misses any opportunity to say something in favour of the Government.

I am suggesting to you, and suggesting in the greatest sincerity, that this is just an effort to give every Liberal M.P. an extra job. It is an opportunity to build around the Prime Minister of our country a coterie of faithful people, who are bound to him, not only by the increased salary which they get as members of Parliament but also because they have become members of the Privy Council and ministers of state. Each minister of state is to be expected, of course, to go by Professor Parkinson's theory and must, in order to assert his importance, build around himself some deputies and secretaries, and so on. I would not mind, if there were any reason for that. Perhaps some speakers on the Government side are going to show the necessity for it.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: I hope that some on the Government side will speak.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Finally, I would make this one small reference. I was Minister of Public Works at a time when we were trying to overcome the recession which we had inherited in 1957. We used to work day and night. I was working 18 hours. I was given an extra job as Minister of Housing, then a third job as minister in charge of the National Capital Commission.

I went down to Arizona at Christmas for the usual two weeks of riding and I found I could not recover. I thought I would drop dead down there, I was so exhausted. At the ranch were two executives, one a vice president of General Electric and the other a vice president of General Motors. After the ride, they used to take me in for a drink. They showed me how to delegate, how to do the job and they gave me the rules for it.

The overall result was this, as the former Mayor of Montreal (Hon. Sarto Fournier) knows, for he was a great friend of mine, as we had a big job and used to work together—

Hon. Mr. Fournier (De Lanaudière): It was most pleasant for me.

Hon. Mr. Walker: How I would like to renew those old days. They were very pleasant.

Hon. Mr. Martin: Home, sweet home.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Let me say that the secret of good administration is this—as Senator Martin found over the years, because he discharged his job with great acumen and skill as Secretary of State for External Affairs—

Hon. Mr. Flynn: Are you suggesting he is not doing a great job now?

Hon. Mr. Walker: I wish he were back there again, for he was a help to Canada. This is the way that you do it. The deputy minister used to come in and say, "Mr. Minister, would you read this and this and this? It will take a couple of days. Then you can make up your mind whether we do this." The solution always was: do not read anything, if you can help it. Tell them to take away