

knew that the hon. member for Kingston was of a somewhat self-sacrificing disposition; he knew that he had had wide experience of human nature generally; but, if he had found many men ready to take a salary upon which a man could live for three months in this city, and give up his whole time to the work, he (Mr. Blake) would certainly be astonished. If a man of that description could be got, it would be found that he was not such an one as would strengthen the Government, but weaken them. He had already referred to the irregularity of which the hon. member for Cumberland had been guilty, in referring to a former debate. But he had also dragged in this discussion now, what might fairly have come up in the Estimates when the House was discussing the subject of salaries, contingencies and expenses. The hon. gentleman had also introduced the question of departmental expenditure without his (Mr. Blake's) wish, and referred to a speech which he addressed to his constituents. Hon. gentlemen opposite had, for a long time, been trumpeting forth the proposition that the expenses of all the Departments had been enormously increased by the present Government. They pointed particularly to the item of contingencies as one regarding which great extravagance had been shown. Now, it seemed to him that, when they were attacked in this way, they should have the right to reply. It seemed to him that those who assailed them hardly acted a fair part when they refused them the right to answer by a simple statement of fact. The hon. gentleman said the comparison made by him (Mr. Blake) was unfair, because he had not taken into account the fact that the expenditure during the year to which he referred did not embrace the expenditure of the First Minister. But, figures which he had submitted—and which could not be disputed—proved that the expense in the Department of the Minister of Justice more than counterbalanced the proportion of the expenses declared to be due to the office of First Minister. He proved that the work of that office had trebled, and the enormous reduction which had taken place in those contingencies certainly did not entitle

hon. gentlemen opposite to complain of the extravagance of that Department, at any rate. The hon. gentleman said he (Mr. Blake) ignored the fact that the salary of the hon. member for Kingston had, until a recent period, been less than his. Now, he was neither discussing the salary of the hon. member for Kingston nor his own. He was merely comparing the rate charged in the month the hon. gentleman left office with the rate charged when he left office. That was the computation on which his conclusion was based. No doubt the salary of the hon. gentleman had, until some months before, been less; but that had nothing to do with the comparison of the expenditure as it stood at the date he left office. Of course, in making the comparison, he excluded that salary for another reason, namely, that the salary of the First Minister was eventually \$1,000 per year more by virtue of the recent regulations than that of the Minister of Justice. The hon. gentleman said a vast amount of work had been done in connection with the organization of the Mounted Police before the Minister of Justice left office. The fact was, that the difficulties connected with the maintenance of that force in remote parts were very great. He hoped, however, that as settlement proceeded, that as they were able to get their supplies on the spot, as the system was evolved, they would not be so onerous; but he found them so while he was in office. It must be remembered that the organization had been but half a force, 150 men, and that they were organized under the right hon. gentleman's successor. Now, he did not wish to detain the House at any length, but he wished to say that one suggestion which the hon. gentleman had made, that this was an increase of the public burthens, was not borne out by facts. It seemed to him (Mr. Blake) to be a proposal for relieving the country of the charge of an officer who held a sinecure, and of lightening the burden of an officer who was overworked, and the better disposing of the thirteen officials which were assigned to the Government by hon. gentlemen opposite at a very early date. The hon. member for Northumberland said