

which had, hitherto, been carried on by virtue of the heads of Department—the different branches of the Government being carried on under the direction of the different Ministers who had a seat in the Legislature, either in this House or the Senate—would, in point of fact, instead of recognizing the principle of a head to each Department, allow two or more heads to each. He was entirely opposed to the admission of that principle, which, he affirmed, was a novelty in this country and in England. Once it was introduced, no one could tell the consequences. At present these Ministers were heads of the Departments, and were answerable to the House for their administration. But, at any moment, the Department might be put under a different head, or under several heads, and no one would be responsible. It would introduce confusion and serve no useful purpose, because each man must necessarily understand all the details of the particular subject under consideration at the time, and, consequently, having two heads would not make it less difficult than having one. This Bill, itself, proved it was not required. If it was once exactly defined what that Department was, and what there was to be done, there was nothing to hinder any amount of business being done by it. Surely an officer brought in peculiarly fitted for the work, not requiring to be elected or to have a seat in this House, but simply engaged to do the work of the Department, would be able to do a greater amount of work than any man who only came in there occasionally. If this Attorney-General was to go round the country and do the work which was now done by the Deputy Minister of Justice in the different parts of the Province, the result would be he would only be able to give a certain portion of his time to his work, and if he was paid the large sum of \$7,000, the cost would be doubled. He was at a loss to know what benefit could arise. Surely the person could not be more competent. If the head of the Department was responsible, that was all that was required. It was very objectionable to introduce two or three heads of Department. If his hon. friend referred to the political

course of the present Government when in Opposition, he would find one of their great arguments was the excessive number of Ministers. Yet, the system they were introducing would extend that to an indefinite extent. He feared that once the door was opened, and it was announced as a correct principle that the Ministry of the day could divide the office, and make any number of dependents on the Government, and use their influence in this House, the result of which would be that they might entirely destroy the liberties of the people by getting too much sway in this House. There was another feature in the Bill which had been pointed out by the hon. member for Cumberland. It did not contemplate, if he read the Bill aright, that, while there were to be two heads, there was to be more than one deputy. But the fact that one deputy was enough to do the work, proved that there was no necessity for an increase in the heads. Surely, if the deputy was the person who ought to do the executive, the actual work, it could not be expected the Minister could do more than direct the work to be done. It could not possibly require two to direct the work of one. He could not see the possibility of a man obeying two masters, directed the one day by one man and the next by another man. If the exigencies of the public service did not require it, or if these hon. gentlemen who made that very expensive head did not find it necessary to create immediately subordinates to do the work ordered by that head, it was positive proof there was no necessity for that head at all. It could not be necessary to create two heads to direct one man; one head ought to be able to direct as much as another man could do. He had no hesitation in saying that he was entirely in accordance with the principle enunciated by the hon. member for Cumberland. He believed that, neither in this country nor in England, ought a Minister of the Crown, a man who was actually in the Cabinet, to go into the Courts as the advocate of any person; that is, in the case of a private individual. It was stated that the Attorney-General in England did so, but he was not a Cabinet Minister; he had no power of

MR. PALMER.