

this: that it was very objectionable that two officers, known as the law officers of the Crown, should be both members of the same Cabinet. The hon. member had had four members conducting the legal business of the Government in Old Canada, and he never objected to the plan then. Why had it suddenly dawned upon him that it was objectionable now? He also said that certain officers should be appointed in the Government who would be understood not to be confined to particular labour, in order that they might be of general assistance to the Government, such as the President of the Council, no doubt. A legal gentleman, possessed of the qualities requisite in the Attorney-General, would be infinitely more useful to the Government than any layman could possibly be occupying the other positions. The other charge he made, was that the duties of that office had not been increased to the extent represented by the Minister of Justice. The right hon. gentleman must be aware that the change in the laws, and many other incidents connected with recent legislation, had materially increased the duties. The hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) had, perhaps, a capacity for work more than any other member in the House, and yet his powers were taxed to the very utmost in order to keep up with the duties of his office. The right hon. member for Kingston had said that the hon. gentleman was relieved of the duties connected with the Mounted Police. That was, however, very little relief from the work in the same Department discharged by the right hon. gentleman.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not lay much stress on that.

MR. MACKENZIE said that being the case he would not say more about it, because the duties were only commencing when the right hon. member for Kingston left office. It had been the case that in all the great colonies in the Australasian system officers were appointed to discharge the duties of Attorney-General in connection with those of Minister of Justice. In New Zealand various statutes had been passed with respect to that

particular position. In 1866, when an Attorney-General was appointed under a new system, he was appointed on good behaviour and was not made a political officer. In 1870 it was found necessary to appoint a Minister of Justice, and in that colony the two offices exist at the present time. In 1876 when it was found inconvenient to have an Attorney-General out of Parliament, an Act was passed which made it optional with the Administration of the day either to have the Attorney-General a non-political or political personage; and under the operation of that Act, in the same year, an Attorney-General was appointed as a responsible Minister, having a seat in Parliament, and had so continued to the present time. The same system prevailed in South Australia, where an Attorney-General and a Solicitor-General were in the House in 1855. In 1861, an Act was passed which made it imperative that the Solicitor-General should not sit in Parliament, but in 1866 the Government brought in a measure making it optional whether the Attorney-General should or should not have a seat. That Bill, however, was not passed, although there was a majority in the House for it, because the Constitution required that any change required an absolute majority of the whole of the members. A similar Bill was brought in by a different Administration in 1870, and carried by a majority, but lost in the same way. In South Victoria, from 1855 to 1859, there were nine Ministers to be appointed by the Governor-General, and of those there were to be an Attorney-General and a Solicitor-General, both having charge of the legal Department. In 1875, a Minister of Justice was appointed in that colony, but the Attorney-General was not a member of either House, although he was still holding a political position, and went out with the Government of the day, if the Government should resign or be defeated. In South Wales, the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General were members of the Government and of the House in 1855. An attempt was made in 1872 to make both offices non-political, but that failed. In 1873, a Minister of Justice was appointed, and the Attor-