

words 'and Receiver-General' after the words "Minister of Finance."

That was a model of a section. He would now read section 8:—

"On and after a day to be fixed by proclamation under an Order of the Governor in Council, the second section of the Act passed in the thirty-sixth year of Her Majesty's reign (1873), chapter thirty-one, shall be amended by striking out the words 'and Attorney General' after the words 'Minister of Justice,' and by adding the words 'and Receiver General' after the words 'Minister of Finance,' and by striking out the words 'The Receiver General' and substituting in lieu thereof the words 'The Attorney General.'"

If any hon. gentleman would inform him what was their meaning he should be glad, for he had devoted some time to them without being able to understand them. He appealed to the House not to permit another law officer in the House, giving to the legal profession a power they ought not to have, and not to allow even a Liberal Government, an economical Government to create an unnecessary office which would cause an additional expenditure of \$10,000 or 12,000 a year.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was opposed the second reading of this Bill. He was opposed to it on principle, because he thought it was a move in the wrong direction. That portion having reference to the office of Attorney-General was certainly not required. As to the abolition of the office of Receiver-General, that, perhaps, was not objectionable. He was quite well aware that the duties of the Receiver-General under the present system were so intimately connected with the Department of Finance that it might well be done away with, supposing that there was a sufficient check on the Finance Department by an efficient system of auditing accounts by an independent officer. In respect to this, there was a little difficulty, arising from the fact that they had several Bills with reference to it, instead of one. They did not know what might be the case; one might pass and the other might not. But in the present case they had the two matters, the abolition of the Receiver-General and the appointment of Attorney-General, presented in one Bill,

so that they might discuss the whole, one question very much depending upon the other. At the same time, he hoped that the abolition of the office of Receiver-General did not carry with it what the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) apprehended, namely: a provision to legislate out of office the hon. member for Shelbourne (Mr. Coffin).

MR. MITCHELL: That is what it does.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said if it did, it would show the Cabinet was not deserving of the high commendations for unity that had been passed upon it. He was the only one Minister who had never committed a blunder since he had been in office, by word or deed. Not one blunder had been attributed to him. Notwithstanding this, the Government were not satisfied; they thought him, to use a common expression, "too good to live." And so he was abolished; but perhaps there might be a future for him, and the salary might be absorbed in other ways. The hon. gentleman, as a member of that House, had the respect and esteem of all who knew him. But, with respect to the alteration in the Department of Justice, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) thought it was altogether in the wrong direction. He objected, on principle, to having two legal men at the head of two separate Departments, as they were, in a sense, both in the Cabinet. There would at once be a difference of opinion in the Cabinet. There ought to be one legal man as the counsel of the Crown, and only one, as in England. The reason why the Attorney-General in England was not in the Cabinet was because the Lord Chancellor was there. The latter was the keeper of the Queen's conscience; he dealt out advice on all legal matters; he was responsible to the Parliament, the Courts, the public, and the bar. There was a real, tangible responsibility by having one man, of the highest standing, who was responsible before the world. There might be a difference of opinion between the Minister of Justice and the Attorney-General, and he held that, for this reason, it was highly objectionable that