

cially would it work badly, having two men sitting in the Cabinet. It had been argued by himself, as in former times by hon. gentlemen opposite, that it was not the business of the Opposition of the day to announce a policy. Well, he would tell the hon. gentlemen what his idea was of the proper mode to meet any increase in the work in that Department, and it could be done without an increase of a farthing's expense to the community. He believed that the Minister of Justice should remain still the Attorney-General. As Minister of Justice, he was the adviser of the Crown; as Attorney-General, he was adviser of the Departments of the Government. Those were so closely connected that they were in effect the same thing; there was such a thin line between them they might be considered as the same thing. In both cases they were advisers on legal questions affecting the public interests. The Minister of Justice should remain Attorney-General. There should be an officer to take charge of the general business, who could, if the Government liked, be called Solicitor-General; let him be a member of the Government if they liked. He supposed there were advantages, political advantages, which would override the other advantage of having a fixed Treasury Solicitor or permanent officer. There were political advantages which would, perhaps, incline the House to decide that it would be well that the Solicitor-General should be a political officer and go out with the Government of the day. He should have a subordinate salary of say \$3,000. He should conduct all the exchequer business, either himself, here, at headquarters, or, if at a distance, by agents. The fees of litigation of the Crown should be funded, and out of that fund his salary should be paid. There should be agents in every Province, and each agent should pay a certain portion of the fees to his principal the Solicitor-General, and otherwise should be put into this fund. And that fund should be large enough to pay the salary of the Attorney-General and have a considerable amount over. Besides paying \$3,000 to the Solicitor-General, he should get, out of this fund, for contentious business in which he went into Court and

held a brief, a moderate fee, upon the same principle that a moderate fee was given to the Crown Counsel who go round on circuit and carry on the criminal prosecutions at the different county assizes, so that he might have a real interest in the business. Human nature was human nature. If he got a certain salary and no fee out of the business, and was opposed to counsel whose income depended upon his successful fighting against the Crown officer, the defence would be very apt to be infinitely more vigorous than the prosecution. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) would have a moderate salary, and would have the fees funded, out of which fund the Solicitor-General would be paid his salary and also a regulated fee, naturally more moderate than what would be given to counsel, because the Solicitor-General would receive a fee on every case in which he went into Court. This business, then, would be very well done, the Solicitor-General aiding the Attorney-General in the House and assisting him, not only in the general business of the House, the Government business in the House, but in defending that Department against the numerous attacks which would and ought to be made upon it, as occasion arose. This, in his opinion, would be a reform in the right direction, thus relieving the Minister of Justice, not of the responsibilities (he ought to be responsible for the duties of Minister of Justice and Attorney-General), but from the actual every-day work, the Solicitor's work, and not compel him to go into Court. The Solicitor-General would be a handy man, always ready to go into the business. That fee fund would be sufficient to cover all the expenses and leave a surplus besides. This was the plan he ventured to suggest to the hon. gentleman. He would only offer one remark more; he opposed, as strongly as he could, the idea of having two legal men dividing the responsibility, dividing the work in legal matters.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had taken one very remarkable point, and had spoken very strongly upon it; indeed, he had made it the chief point of his objection. It was

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.