

cannot do it satisfactorily with its present machinery. Yet I am satisfied, honourable gentlemen, that if this country were being administered by the men who manage our great railways, our banks, or other financial corporations, they would investigate the situation and determine what is really the difficulty. We are at present helpless to deal with it. I say that if the Government had proper machinery for examining into great questions of this kind so that a pronouncement could be made, that pronouncement would be accepted by the people of Canada as conclusive. But no pronouncement on the subject can be made to-day. True, we appoint a Royal Commission and place upon it three or four men who are absolute strangers to the problems to be investigated. They are gentlemen of leisure, or they are gentlemen in need. They are sent out through the country, at the expense of the Treasury, for the purpose of examining into something about which they know nothing, and about which, when they conclude, they will know less than when they began.

The futility of the machinery which we have in dealing with large questions may be demonstrated also in this way. During the war, when large questions were under consideration, when great problems had to be solved, did the Government of Canada, or did the Government of England, rely upon departmental machinery to solve them? No. The Government of Canada called in boards of experts for nearly every phase of the war which had to be dealt with. They were business men; they were experts in the particular subject under consideration. They were not military scientists, but business men with a comprehensible knowledge of business problems. When the United States wished to cut down expenditure what did they do? Did they have their departmental experts make inquiry? No, honourable gentlemen; they appointed a non-political body, and that non-political body cut down expenditures in accordance with what I have read. What was done in England? When Great Britain recognized that her expenditures had to be lopped off, had to be cut to the bone, so to speak, did she leave the task of investigation to governmental machinery which has been in operation so long that memory runneth not to the contrary? No. Outside experts were called in and instructed to deal with the situation just as in the case of a financial or commercial company. And, honourable gentlemen, that is what should be done here. I say it is impossible to curtail expenditure unless the authority dealing with the matter is specially charged with doing

it. I say that a Government, Members of Parliament or Deputy Ministers, by means of the machinery we have, in Parliament, in the Government, or in the Departments, cannot do it, because everything is against it. The pressure which is brought to bear by constituents and by all parties concerned is entirely opposed to reduction of expenditure. Let me instance the case of a Minister who attempts to cut down the expenditure of his Department. What immediately confronts him? His constituents protest against such a reduction. They must have patronage. If the proposed reduction relates to the Civil Service, the friends of the men who are going to suffer by the curtailment at once attack it. A Deputy Minister cannot cut down the expenditure of his Department; at least, it is exceptional for him to be able to do so; because every man under him is protesting against the reduction of that expenditure, and he must depend upon the loyalty of his staff if he is to administer his department successfully. Consequently the entire pressure is along the line of expenditure. If in the House of Commons the Government should attempt to cut down the pork-barrel distribution of prestige or of patronage, members are up in arms; they are not going to stand for it; their constituents insist upon this; and so on. Fundamentally, honourable gentlemen, it is all wrong. Unless we have properly constituted boards appointed for that purpose, who have nothing to gain and who are answerable to Parliament, satisfactory curtailment will not take place.

My honourable friend has alluded to the Audit Board being charged with the cutting down of expenditures. While the Audit Board has probably done most excellent work up to the present time, it is not at all adapted for this particular purpose. The Audit Board is made up of gentlemen who are accountants. That Board is not made up of men familiar with organization and with the carrying on of great constructive and administrative work. This Government could constitute a Board of the best experts to be found in Canada, borrowed, if necessary, from the railways and great financial institutions, to re-establish the Departments on the principles of the great institutions from which these men come.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: May I ask my honourable friend if he has any reasonable hope that a Government of either complexion would follow the recommendations of those special Boards, of which he speaks? Does not the pork barrel exist pretty nearly everywhere where there is party government?