

open to the pressure of friends for the appointment of certain individuals who never would have been pressed upon them, if the duties of the office necessarily involved such an amount of ability and talent as Ministers of this country should undoubtedly possess. He held it to be a wise and judicious procedure on the part of the Government to have abolished an office which had been regarded, and properly so, as, to a very large extent, a sinecure. But it would require a vast amount of reasoning, more than had yet been offered, to show that the substitution of the plan proposed by the Government was a wise one. He held it to be altogether at variance with the facts as they existed, with the history of the matter and past experience in regard to it. He could see no objection to the plan proposed by the right hon. member for Kingston, that a Solicitor-General should be substituted, he not being given a seat in the Cabinet, for his appointment would entail no increased cost to the country, because he would be charged with duties now performed by persons outside of the Government, and for which the public money was paid.

MR. MACKENZIE: What good would that do?

MR. TUPPER said it would do this good: it would give the Government the services of a legal officer who might not only be employed in the discharge of those special duties, but questions on which the Premier desired to obtain a legal opinion might be submitted to him. The appointment of such an officer would not increase the number of Cabinet members, and his legal talents would be available to the Government without incurring any increased cost to the country. As he had said, the objection to the Bill was that it involved an unnecessary increase in the number of Cabinet Ministers. He would not enter into the question connected with the attacks made on the late Government respecting the number of Ministers, but simply called attention to the fact that so soon as those hon. gentlemen were called upon to form an Administration, they increased the number of Ministers. He desired to know if the

office of Receiver-General could be abolished; if not, why was it necessary to create another Minister, and that in the Department of Justice? Let him call the attention of the House to the position in which the question stood to-day. When the right hon. member for Kingston was Minister of Justice, he was found equal to the discharge of the duties. The fact was he had not only the duties of the office of Attorney-General, as they were now performed, but he had, in addition, the Mounted Police organization.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. TUPPER said that the hon. the First Minister said "no;" but he would tell the hon. gentlemen that through the incumbency of his right hon. friend, all the enormous work connected with the organization of the Force was performed.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

MR. TUPPER: Yes; and I know all about it.

MR. MACKENZIE: So do I.

MR. TUPPER said he knew that in this Department the enormous work connected with the organization of the Mounted Police Force was arranged, and when the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, they found the whole matter cut and dried to their hand.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. TUPPER: That is a fact.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. TUPPER: They found a large force enlisted and despatched to the North-West, and the whole question, in all its bearings, dealt with by his right hon. friend, the late Minister of Justice and his Department, and that in a most vigorous and effective and thorough manner. This was the condition of affairs at the time; and it was only after his right hon. friend was relieved from the discharge of these duties that the Mounted Police Force and all the great and very large amount of work connected with the service—and these were never larger than when it was in its incipient state of organization—was transferred to the Department of the Secretary of State. So there was no excuse for this

MR. TUPPER.