

has an interview with the Colonial Secretary, to the under secretary, or the permanent head of the department, who is not subject to appeal to the people, and there is where he will get information, and, I was going to add, instruction upon the question at issue.

Now every man who has been in the government is aware that no matter how trivial the question may be affecting the importation of, say, a horse, if there is a difference arising between the importer and the government, the man who complains will never be satisfied until he has an interview and takes up the time of the minister to settle it. If the principle prevailed that under secretaries or deputy heads could give their decision, then there would be an end to it, and the labour that devolves upon a minister of the Crown would be relieved to a very great extent, and the minister would be able to give more attention to the public policy of the country. I remember distinctly in my own case, Sir John Macdonald making this remark to me when some great question was under consideration: 'Bowell, the details of the Customs Department are of such a character that they prevent the head of it from devoting time to the consideration of greater questions which affect the whole Dominion that he should give to it.' My hon. friends opposite will admit that that sentence alone explains the reason why ministers are overworked. As has been indicated by the gentleman who has just addressed the House, if you can remove from the departments that perpetual pestering of ministers by political opponents and political friends in the ordinary administration of the affairs of the country, you will have the difficulty of over-work removed to a very great extent. I know it has been said that the appointment of controllers was a failure. Why was it a failure? The appointment of controllers was for the purpose of relieving the heads of departments from dealing with office details of which the ministers complained; but the controllers were too ambitious to submit to the positions in which they were placed, and instead of reporting upon great questions to the minister under whose charge they were, that is the Minister of Trade and Commerce, they were perpetually com-

ing in conflict with the minister by assuming powers and authority with which they had nothing whatever to do; the result was that when the present government came in power they changed the law and raised the two controllers in that department to the position of cabinet ministers. I admit that the ambition of the controllers, and the fact that they considered themselves it an inferior position, led to that change. The question now arises as to the creation of a new department. Is it necessary? Why could not the duties which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has given as the reason for appointing a new minister, be performed just as well by the gentleman who has held the position of Deputy Minister of Labour under the Postmaster General? It would not give the minister much additional labour. The deputy minister could perform all the duties which he will have to discharge if he is made head of the department, without this additional expenditure. Thirty years ago, the opposition complained of the number of heads of departments, claiming that a smaller number could transact the business of the country. True, there was not as much work to be done then as there is now; but the adoption of the English system of appointing under secretaries, would have met that contingency. Another question which was raised by Mr. Blake at that time, was the question of remuneration to heads of departments. He claimed that the head of each department should be paid in proportion to the labour and responsibility involved in administering that department. Like most of the reforms advocated by the Liberal party in opposition, that principle was not adopted by the Liberal government when it came into power. On the contrary, Mr. Blake accepted the position of President of the Privy Council, which entailed the least labour and responsibility in the cabinet, but no attempt was made by the Liberal government to reduce the salary attached to the office. Will the right hon. gentleman tell us what is the intention of the government in appointing a deputy head of the Department of Labour? Is he to be a university man, as the head of the department is, and are all the officials of the department to be of the same class, or are we to have a practical labour man, as