

same salary. When we come to look at these different salaries, the House will see we have not erred as to them in the direction of extravagance. Whether or not we want quite all the servants we have got, remains to be seen. So far as our experience has gone, I believe it is the opinion of my colleagues—it is my own—that we have not got larger establishments than we want; but if we find they can bear reduction, we shall reduce them. A few days ago, an officer died; we will not fill his place unless it is necessary. [Cheers.] But there is no use in my pretending to this House, that the public business can be well done unless we have got men enough to do it. It is my business to have the public accounts carefully kept, and all manner of outside accounts thoroughly audited. Do you mean to tell me that if I find it requires eight or ten persons to do the work well, I am serving the public interest by leaving it to six or seven? The thing is absurd; you must have the necessary number of men, and good men; for a bad man is worse than no man at all; and to get good men you must pay them a fair price. [Cheers.] We adopt the same rule for our own salaries, for this House and for its Speaker. We have taken as a general rule for the heads of departments resident here, the scale of three-fourths of the salaries paid at Ottawa; amounting to \$3,750. The two members of the Government having no departments in their charge are placed on a different footing; and one member of the Government, our Premier, is, by the consent of us all, placed on a different footing still. As to him we have thought it right—and I speak more in the name of his colleagues than of himself—to adopt this course. We felt it out of the question that he could be called on to serve at the same salary as we, the other heads of departments. When called on to fill his present position, he was the holder of a non-political office, one filled with the greatest credit, and respecting which he was not in the slightest danger in any way. Its salary was \$4,000 a year. Now, to ask him to come into a political office at a less salary, would be practically a political insult which I think the House would not be guilty of. [Cheers.] We thought it no more than right—and the House will, I believe, think also—that he, as Minister of Education and Premier, should receive at least \$1,000 more than we do; the total, \$4,750, being still below the Ottawa salaries. Then, as to the Speaker of the Legislative Council, we have placed his salary, as the counterpart to that of the Speaker of this House, at \$3,200 a year. The difference as in his favor is justified by the fact that he is a member of the Executive Council, and although not living in Quebec is obliged to be continually ready to come here on public duty. He must spend a great deal of time here, because he is responsible for all our doings; and is put to such risk and trouble as renders this salary no more than sufficient. As to the Solicitor-General, who also is not the head of a department, we have come to this conclusion. At one time it was seriously considered whether we would or would not fall back on an old practice in regard to his office, and give him only a small salary, say \$1,000, and the fees of certain prosecutions. But after thinking over this matter, we came to the conclusion it was a vicious and paltry system, which we could not recommend to the House. If either the Solicitor or Attorney General, being the parties who must check all the expenditures of prosecuting counsel and others, have any sort of interest in those accounts, there is something radically wrong in the system. We came to the conclusion, therefore, that the Solicitor as well as the Attorney General must receive a