

there should be two legal men in the Cabinet. He did not say two lawyers, but two men having a right to speak authoritatively of law connected with the Crown; one should be out of the Cabinet, just the same as in England. The Attorney-General was a high officer, a highly-paid officer, a most important officer, a man who had charge of the administration of the legal affairs of the country, subject to the higher supervision of the Chancellor, but yet he was not in the Cabinet. And he ought not to be in the Cabinet, for fear of a division of responsibility, and a fear that the people would have no legal principle to govern the Government. True, Cabinets were said to be united; well, we knew they were. But look at the state of England now, of the Parliament, the people, and the Press. There was no legal constitutional collision so long as the Cabinet remained together, yet everybody knew there was a war party and a peace party in the Cabinet; Lord Carnarvon, Earl Derby, and formerly Earl Salisbury, representing the peace party; Gathorne Hardy, Lord Beaconsfield and the majority, belonging to the war party. We all knew that; we all knew how the Cabinet was formed; we knew their antecedents—what their previous opinions were; and we supposed, that unless they had undergone some miraculous conversion in being sworn into office, they must have the same opinions. It was highly objectionable, for the same reason as it was highly inexpedient that Courts of Appeals should decide in an uncertain sound, that there should be two leading members of the Cabinet having legal duties to perform, and obliged to be legal advisers, more or less, in their respective Departments. It must produce weakness, vacillation, and want of unity of action. He did not see there was any necessity in the increase of the work, for the creation of these additional offices. He would have said that the Government had a right to claim credit for retrenchment after doing away with the Receiver-General's Department, thinking and believing, and he agreed with them to a certain extent, it had become obsolete, and that there was

no necessity for a separate Department, at all events, a separate head. That was altogether aside from the general question: The hon. member for Chateauguay, who knew so well the opinion which prevailed in England, was aware there ought to be in every Cabinet some offices without any particular departmental duties attached to them, so that those individuals might be used as handy men to take up any subject of particular interest at the time in connection with the administration of affairs. He did not think the Government could use that argument in defence of keeping up the Receiver-General's Department. He was not at all aware, although the Receiver-General had not many departmental duties to perform, that the Government had utilized his services in any other Department whatever, or on any other subject whatever. He thought the Government could fairly claim, and ought fairly to claim, some credit for the retrenchment of those offices. It was the abolishment of a useless department and a saving to the country. But with their usual should he call it ill luck, they had contrived, while they might have had the credit of making this saving, to spoil it all by dividing the administration of the Department of Justice and giving it to a legal man. As a legal man himself, he was rejoiced to see more avenues to professional advancement and honour than existed before. He thought that lawyers in this country or continent could not complain of not having a full share of political honour and position. But he did not believe the increase of business had been such as to warrant the proposed division. In fact, if, under this Act, the duties of Attorney-General and the duties of Minister of Justice were essentially the same, as was provided in the Act of 1868, which had been carried by the late Administration, the main portion of the increase of work must belong to the Attorney-General's office. There was very little left to do for the Minister of Justice if the Attorney-General had got to do all the work, and he would be obliged to do all the work provided by law. He would be merely a legal adviser, a chamber counsel; to assist in Council, with very

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.