

other. There, of course, they have an immensely larger and an infinitely more complicated field of administrative work than it is possible for us to have in this country, and therefore it is necessary for them to have a larger number of persons engaged in the administration of public affairs in order to master the details, and to make the Parliament acquainted with the details of each Department of the Government. The administrative machine in England is, perhaps, not by any means as efficient as it might be. We know what the custom is in that country, and how they are addicted to allow matters to go on from time to time without any other alteration than such as may arise from additions. Sir James Mackintosh said long ago that it was something like a gentleman's mansion. It had little architectural beauty, but it had perhaps very little inconvenience, additions had been made to it from time to time, which made it unwise to tear it down in order to make a more symmetrical structure, but no man in the world who was about to build an original structure would take it for a model. It seems to me that the tendency of the hon. gentleman is to undertake to make a system of administrative government upon a model, which, in a new country, ought never to be followed. It always seemed to me that the Italian system was very much better adapted to a new country like Canada than that of England. The hon. gentleman has, no doubt, examined it and considered it. A Minister of the Crown having charge of a particular Department, though a member of but one House, may nevertheless speak for the Government in both; and as an administrator of the Government, responsible for the conduct of an important Department, he is at liberty to act as an exponent and defender of that Department in both Houses. If we were to have a change at all, a change based upon the Italian system, it seems to me, is much better adapted to the wants of a comparatively new and poor country in which the administrative machinery need not be complex, and in which that machinery ought to be kept as simple as possible. It is always easier to exercise effective control over the administration of a Department when it is under the conduct of a single head, than when it is under the control of two. Now, I am not, any more than my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), going to oppose this measure at this particular stage, but I think the House would make a great mistake in allowing the Bill to go through in silence, or without full consideration. Every change in the organisation or administration of a Department of the Government, ought to receive a very full consideration, certainly a much fuller consideration than we would give to an ordinary measure, because it is part of the machine by which the operations of the Government are to be carried on, and being so, it ought to receive very full consideration at the hands of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I leave to hon. gentlemen opposite the business of reconciling their views concerning this measure. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says there must be good reasons given for altering the present organisation. He, himself, suggests a very considerable alteration by adopting the Italian system, as that would involve an application to the Imperial Government, and an alteration of the British North America Act. I think I would rather listen to the counsels of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). His suggestion is that the Cabinet should be reduced, and that there should be subordinate officers, members of the Government, but not members of the Cabinet. That is exactly what this system is intended to introduce, and eventually will be brought into force, having the effect of reducing the number of Cabinet Ministers.

Mr. MITCHELL. I differ not only from the views of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), but I differ

entirely with the right hon. gentleman as to the necessity of this Bill at all. I do not think this Bill is calculated to advance the true interests of the Administration of public affairs. I think the whole tendency of the Administration is to increase the expense and increase the heads of the Department. The right hon. gentleman, a Session or two ago, divided his Department into four, and made four heads. Have we found any special advantage from that? Have the expenses been reduced? Have there not been as many complaints against the manner in which supplies are let, and the public affairs administered? Sir, what would be the result here? There will be a policy in relation to one Department different from that which will be applied to another Department of the Government. This new Department of Trade and Commerce is to have supervision of these other two Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue, of which they are to be sub-heads. Do they propose reducing the position of my hon. friend, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan) from being a member of the Cabinet to that of a sub-head in the Department to be created? Is it the object of this Bill to get rid of my hon. friend? If that is the object of this Bill, why is it not so stated at once? What do they propose to do with the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bowell)? Do they propose to get rid of him, too? Is that the object of the Bill? It looks to me very like it, and I think if it is the object, they had better state it at once. My objection to the Bill is that it is adding to the expense of the country. It is a Bill which is not in the direction of the public interest, a Bill which, I believe, is going to increase, not alone the expense of an additional head of Department, but going to add a new staff of officers, which will constantly increase. We will want new buildings directly if this system goes on. I think we had better economise the public affairs of this country, reduce the debt and keep down the charges, and endeavor to relieve us from the payment of the enormous annual sum of ten or eleven millions interest which we are paying to-day. That is the course which the Government ought to take in their legislature, instead of going on, year after year, with Bills changing the laws and creating new Departments in the direction of adding to the expense of the country, as this Bill is going to do. I say this will be the result of it, and for my part I am opposed to the principle of the Bill, and when the subject is up again for discussion, I shall endeavor to give my views at greater length in order that the country may understand what the Government are doing.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Could the First Minister give us an idea what will be the probable cost of this Department; because we could consider that in detail when it comes up for discussion at a future time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is proposed that on the second reading the two Bills shall be discussed together, and I hope the principle of this Bill will be adopted by the House, as I suppose it will be, and I hope the principle of the other Bill as well, on Tuesday. Then after that we can go into Committee of the Whole on the two Bills, and full discussion can be taken on every clause, including the cost of the measure.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not wish to discuss the measure to-day, but I quite concur in the remarks made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that this country is being, to some extent, governed to death. The increase of officials has been something alarming for the last few years, and it is about time the Government should call a halt, instead of going on to increase the Departments as they propose by these two Bills.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.