

probably have occasion, at a future time, to allude to it. He merely wished to answer the hon. member on one or two points which he had raised with respect to this Bill, as if it introduced some new principle. The hon. gentleman pretended that by it the Minister of Justice would have the liberty to practise in the Courts. Assuredly there was no provision in the Bill establishing such a principle. The hon. gentleman would recollect that it merely extended the provisions of a Bill which had been passed by his friend, creating the Department of Justice, and giving to it some additional aid and assistance. The hon. member for St. John pretended that they were giving two heads to one Department, forgetting entirely the fact that in England, and in all constitutional Governments, the Law Department of the Crown was superintended and administered by Attorneys and Solicitors General; and, certainly, there was no intention to take away from the Minister of Justice a legitimate portion of the work which devolved upon the Department. No such provision was made in the Bill. Aid was merely given to the Minister of Justice on account of the immense amount of work which had lately accrued, and which devolved upon the Department. The right hon. member for Kingston might speak of the time when he could administer with perfect ease this Department, but it had been proven that the work of the Department had since increased more than three-fold, it had increased four-fold, and, certainly, if the hon. gentleman was then competent to do one-fourth of the present amount of work, there was nothing unjust or irrational in demanding that, as the work had increased four-fold, some better system should be devised, in order to meet the exigencies of the situation. No one would pretend to say that the late Minister of Justice was not capable to fulfil the labour which had devolved upon the Department. The hon. gentleman admitted and declared that it was impossible for him or any man to perform the duties which were incumbent on this office. He (Mr. Laflamme) did not pretend, and he did not believe there was any

MR. LAFLAMME.

man on the other side of the House who would pretend, to be able to discharge these duties better than the late Minister of Justice. He (Mr. Laflamme) was not so able, and he did not pretend that this was the case. He would declare that he could not or did not do the work as well as the hon. gentleman, or as much work as the hon. gentleman had performed. Whoever fulfilled these duties would find it to be impossible for any man to do justice to the Department without having some additional assistance. Hon. members could not forget that the responsibility for the entire legislation of the country fell upon this Department, as well as the administration and responsibility of the legal acts of every Department. The right hon. member for Kingston had alleged as an excuse, that the new Ministers were fresh and without experience, and that, consequently, more work fell on the Department of Justice than would otherwise have been the case. The hon. gentleman forgot that the deputy heads of the Departments, who were naturally their advising officers, had not been changed; and these were men accustomed to the work, and who, notwithstanding the experience of the former Ministers, were those who had advised them, and upon whom those Ministers had relied for the good administration of their Departments. Hence, the new Ministers had these same advantages; and it was not owing to the incoming of a new Administration that additional work had been thrown upon the Department of Justice. He was satisfied that, as far as the reason alleged by the right hon. member for Kingston—who admitted that it would be necessary to appoint a Solicitor-General—was concerned, it was without foundation. The hon. member for South Bruce had clearly shown what would be the advantage as regarded the responsibility for advice given to the Administration, if such an officer received the paltry remuneration of \$3,000 a year. This officer would then be compelled to seek for emoluments outside of his office and to practise in the Courts. What advantage would thereby be gained? What additional assistance would be given with regard to the division of