

in the House, and an adverse vote was cast, the Government would go out, and with it, the Minister.

In these points, Cabinet responsibility does not differ from present practice, but in the carrying out of the work, its design, the way the contracts are given, the prices, the manner of execution, there is no Cabinet responsibility. The responsibility is on the Minister of Public Works in carrying out the work allotted to him. He stands before the House as an Executive Officer charged with carrying out certain work, not as one member of a Cabinet who stand and fall together, and who can call, when any of their acts are challenged, on the party loyalty of all their supporters in the House.

I venture to think, and I trust some of those who listen to me, will agree that no better system could be devised to heighten Ministerial responsibility and to make easier the control of parliament.

These are both things recommended by the British Committee as highly desirable in quite different circumstances from those of Canada, where expenditures on Public Works, using the term in a wider sense, are about the only expenditures which can be curtailed, and so make it peculiarly desirable that the shields of a diluted responsibility and of Party loyalty should not protect extravagance and inefficiency.

Another point on which the English report dwells is the importance of full examination and research before action is taken. Outside the sphere of their own immediate personal knowledge, Ministers have to act in many cases on information which they know is prejudiced and interested. The bettering of the machinery of government which we are considering, would involve laying before the government, and, therefore, parliament, information as full, as accurate and as independent as is possible. I propose the setting up of two agencies. One of them is in existence elsewhere; the other, I think, will be new.

The first of them is the Tariff Commission. It would deal with all facts connected with production, transportation and living conditions, both in Canada and other countries. This matter has been so much discussed that I shall only touch on it in the briefest way. Its advantages have recently been set forth in the press. Such a commission would give on this question, which, as we all know, excites the liveliest passions, and threatens to make sectional divisions in a country which requires to be united, facts, insofar as the facts can be ascertained as they actually are. It would leave to the government