

Deficiencies

Some of the characteristics and idiosyncracies of Dr. Skelton have been described. He was the head, the leader, the chief of the Department for a decade and a half. His character left its imprint on the Department and its members; some of that imprint continues. But emphasis on these characteristics must not be exaggerated. Dr. Skelton was too humble, shy, and simple a man to be a great leader; he was too scholarly-minded to be a great administrator or builder; in scholarship he was uneven, sometimes original rather than profound, sometimes biased rather than purely objective. In political views, although he guided or advised both Mr. Bennett and Mr. King, it is doubtful that he showed a political flair. He seems to have taken less interest in United States policies and affairs in the keen way Christie did. He was apparently not enamoured with Great Britain, or with anything of the old Imperial concept. He was a simple "Canadian" at heart, but perhaps not precise or clear in his own mind as to the shape and form, constitutionally and otherwise, this Canadianism should take. Christie scrutinized these problems far more intensely, being law-trained, dispassionately and analytically. There is little evidence that Dr. Skelton fully scrutinized all these difficult problems. He had inherited some of them. For example, the decision had been made in