

Administration at the present day, and who was an active politician and partisan, and yet was an administrator of justice. He did not understand why his hon. friend referred to Mr. Archibald; he was never appointed to the Bench.

MR. BLAKE: He was appointed to the Nova Scotia Bench.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He never sat.

MR. BLAKE: I did not say that; I said he was appointed.

MR. PALMER said what he did say was, that the people of this country would never consent to have a Judge a member of that House. As in England, when they ascended to the Bench, they should leave politics entirely behind them, and should keep themselves entirely apart from politics.

MR. MILLS: What about the Lord Chancellor?

MR. PALMER: Well, he holds the position for a certain time. He occupies the very position my hon. friend the Minister of Justice occupies; and therefore, he is placed in an entirely different position.

MR. BLAKE: He is a Judge, and one of the highest Judges, and appoints all the other Judges.

MR. PALMER said he did not think this country would approve of such an appointment being made. A Judge, as he said before, should be entirely apart from political influences. He understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) to state that the gentleman who occupied the position of Minister of Justice and Attorney-General should not withdraw from the Bar. He was not going to differ with him, if he undertook that the office should be confined to one person; but they might put any number of persons in the Cabinet, all of whom would then be able to come forward in the Courts and practice at leisure.

MR. BLAKE. No, I did not say that was my opinion. I said that was the rule in England.

MR. PALMER said if he understood the hon. gentleman rightly he had been quoting facts to support his view that

these gentlemen should go into Court and practice. It was perfectly true this was the rule in England with reference to the Attorney-General, but he was not in the Cabinet; but they were so particular, as his hon. friend had pointed out, that no person who went into the Cabinet was allowed to practice at the Bar at all. Why should it be otherwise? It might be said that there was a great necessity for keeping up the practice; if so, why should these Departmental offices be increased? If he understood it rightly, the Government of this country had proceeded in the principle of each one of the heads being responsible to Government for its own Department. Now, if this Act passed, they would have that plain rule entirely overcome. They would have repeated what has been seen over and over again this Session. When a Minister came down to justify an act, he simply said some one in the Department, some engineer, or some deputy-head recommended it, and, therefore, the Government did it. He held that that system was entirely vicious. He held that the fact of the engineer, or the deputy, or any one else, giving a report was no justification for the action of the Government. In another particular, too, this was the most extraordinary Bill that he had ever heard of. First, as to what was the duty of these officers. They had to have a separate head or an alternate head; one clause providing that the Minister of Justice should be the head, and another that the Government may assign to one or the other any part of the duties of the office. Under this clause, he thought it would be pretty hard, hereafter, to tell where the responsibility rested. Instead of having a single head and a single Department, with somebody responsible for it, the responsibility would be shifted from one Minister to another. This was the first time such a principle had been introduced, and he asked the House to pause before adopting it. He contended that this legislation would be wrong in undertaking to put a single Department of the Government under two heads; in other words, that this legislation would introduce a principle by which the Government of the country