

they ought to diminish the number of Ministers; but the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) well knew the difficulty in reducing the number of members of the Cabinet was so great as to be almost insurmountable. What did they do when there were only four Provinces in the Union? The number which they had laid down as the ground-work for the formation of the Cabinet had left difficulties which were now almost insurmountable. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) then laid down the principle of sectional representation. He alleged that there must be two members of the Cabinet from each Province, that one man from a Province would feel himself alone in the Cabinet; that he would want some one from his own Province to counsel with; that the smallest Province, therefore, should have two members in the Cabinet. He pointed out, further, that there being two for the least Province, there should for the large and important Province of Quebec, be double that number; and Ontario, being still larger, the least number she would be contented with would be five; and he thus summed up the number of thirteen as the minimum number of Cabinet Ministers for four Provinces, and that was the statement upon which he defended that organization. The hon. gentleman now said that the executive business of this Parliament had not increased. What was stated in the Speech from the Throne in the Session of 1873? What did the hon. gentleman then put into the mouth of His Excellency in the fall of that year? He alleged that the legislative and executive business of the Dominion had so increased that additional legislative and executive agencies were necessary. And the hon. gentleman to-day said that the business had not increased; and, in effect, that there was no necessity for more than twelve Ministers. He said, in 1873, there should be more than thirteen, how many more the House did not know, probably would never know now; but if his former principles were carried out, even with a modification, it could not be less than three more. If they talked of consistency, he would compare the statement of the hon. gentle-

man in 1873, with regard to this question, and his utterances now. There was more analogy in this than in comparing the views of the Reform party in 1867 with their views now, because circumstances had arisen which must necessarily have changed their views.

MR. PALMER said that perhaps he did not understand the exact position of these Ministerial changes. It might be that the business of the Cabinet had increased, as the hon. member for South Bruce had stated; but whether it was so or not, he thought it had very little to do with the question involved in the measure. As he understood it, our constitution was modelled on that of Great Britain, under the North America Act, the Minister of Justice being intended to represent the office of Attorney-General in England. If he understood his hon. friend aright, they now intended to place not only a number of Attorney-Generals in the Provinces, but also any number of persons representing the Crown, either in Parliament or out of Parliament, that the Government of the day might think it necessary to put in. He contended that principle was opposed to the British constitution. He did not understand the great objection made to the remarks of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) upon the point. That gentleman did not make any insinuation against the independence of the Bar; he did not insinuate that the Bar of this country were of different calibre or more liable to be influenced from doing their duty by having to appear against a Minister of the Crown than they were in England; but he thought it was unfortunate that this country had not followed the policy of England in this matter. If it, therefore, happened that a Judge of one of the highest Courts entered Parliament, he thought the people would have raised their voices against a member of the Government, being a Judge, before whom they had to come for justice.

MR. BLAKE: Are you referring to Mr. Morris or Mr. Archibald?

MR. PALMER said he was referring to a gentleman in his hon. friend's native Province, who was head of an

MR. BLAKE.