COLONIAL LEGISLATURE.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, March 1853.

DEBATE ON THE SALARIES BILL.

(Continued from Hazzard's Gazette, No. 28.)

Hon. Mr. WHELAN continued: What is the object—of course I mean the ostensible object—of this wonderful effort of legislative sagacity? I suppose it is to economise the public money,—to reduce the emoluments of the Attorney General and Queen's Printer; but I am not aware that it provides for a reduction of the labors of either office, or the costs attending their management. This object, then, presupposes that both officers are overpaid;—it presupposes that they are in the habit of making charges not commensurate with the duties they are required to perform. It was certainly incumbent upon the hon. member for Darnley to establish this point, if he could. It was clearly his duty to shew that the public had paid higher professional fees to the Attorney General than those allowed to his predecessor; and that the Queen's Printer had made charges against the Government not warranted by the practice of *his* predecessor. He has not, however, done so; he cannot do so;—but his officious interference in the matter must lead to the opinion, that in *his* immaculate belief both officers are public extortioners. Now, since the hon. member appeared to be ignorant of the course he should have taken in reference to this matter, I will take the liberty of telling him; and perhaps before the subject be brought to a close, he may be induced to act upon the information. If he thought the Attorney General and Queen's Printer were overpaid, he should have moved for a Committee of Enquiry—and demanded before that Committee an examination of the Accounts of both Officers, and compared those Accounts with the charges made by their predecessors. If the result of such enquiry justified his apprehensions, and proved that the officers in question had overcharged the public, then it would have been right to compel them to refund the excess, and to establish a proper scale of charges, so as to prevent extortion for the future. But instead of that very obvious and very proper course of action, the hon. member flings out a proposition which exposes two of his political friends to the most scandalous imputations. How well the opportunity has been turned to account, has been just shewn by a member on the other side of the House;—that member appears to have studied the Queen's Printer's Accounts with great zeal; and he must feel deeply indebted to the member for Darnley, who has given rise to this occasion for spurting forth his resentment against me. But I shall come to his observations and quotations from my Accounts by and bye;—and I think I shall shew that on this, as well as on other occasions, his bungling and special pleading is likely to be far more damaging to the character of his own client—who happens to be the late Queen's Printer—than to the party on the other side, whom he is hired to assail. Is the principle of the Bill a just and equitable one? If it is, why was it not thought of before? The hon. member has been seven years in the House; he has had the Accounts of the Queen's Printer and Attorney General every Session before him;—those of the former, for the past two years especially, have been thumbed like an old primer in the hands of a school boy, and many a voyage of discovery has been made through their pages, to discover an error or an overcharge. If the principle of the Bill is just and equitable now, it was equally so when the fees of the Secretary and other public officers were commuted some years ago for fixed salaries,—and the hon. member was then amongst us. But the bright idea did not flash upon his mind whilst his political opponents were in office. During Sir Henry Huntley's administration of the Government there were actually three Queen's Printers in the Colony; Mr. Hazzard stood at the head of the list, as he held what he called his patent; but Mr. Ings reprinted almost every thing that appeared in the Gazette, except the laws; and Messrs. Cooper & Bremner, in their turn, reprinted the official notices after Mr. Ings;—so that each had a very handsome share of the public plunder. The principle of this Bill was neither just nor necessary in those days; nor does it appear to be considered just or necessary by its introducer in reference to other officers paid by fees, as well as the Attorney General. If the hon. member wished to bring forward an honest and impartial Bill, why not have made it general in its details? Why not have included the Solicitor General?—he is paid by fees as well as the Attorney General; and the Clerk of the Crown and Prothonotary?—he is paid in the same manner; and the High Sheriffs of the Counties,—whose emoluments, with the exception of £20 to each, consist of indeterminate fees? Why not have included in the Bill all these officers, and others who may happen to be paid in a similar manner? Of course, the principle of the Bill would not be just and equitable if made to apply to any others but the Attorney General and Queen's Printer. But, Sir, I do not think the principle is a sound one, with regard even to the Attorney General: and as to the office of Queen's Printer, it is totally impracticable. It is very proper to pay a fixed salary to a public functionary like the Treasurer, or Secretary, whose duties are well, or tolerably well defined, and involve no mental toil or study,—who enters his office without it being necessary for him to undergo a certain course of training; but with regard to such an officer as the Attorney General, or even Solicitor General, he has had to acquire a profession, which must have cost a large amount of time and money; and as to his duties as one of the Crown Law Officers, it is impossible to define them, with the view of determining what his salary should be,—in one year he may have more Crown business to transact than in two other years; and for the former, with a salary, he must be either greatly underpaid, or, in the latter years, shamefully overpaid. But suppose you fix a salary for the Attorney General, you must fix it at the average of what the emoluments of that office have been,—unless it is meant to perpetrate an act of injustice. I don't expect the hon. mover of the Bill will be disposed to do this, for his object is to reduce the emoluments of the officers affected by his Bill, and not to put them on a footing with their predecessors. But let us see what is the average of the fees received by the Attorney General. I hold in my hand a return of the emoluments of that office from 1848 to the present time. For that period the average of the Attorney General's allowances has been about £450 a year; for the first year mentioned in this Return, the amount of fees and salary paid to Mr. Hodgson was £550; whilst the last year Mr. Young received only £437,—which is the lowest amount paid to the Attorney General, according to the statement I hold in my hand. [Mr. Whelan here commented upon the several items contained in the return, and observed—] With regard to the charges for conducting Crown Prosecutions, they were fully as large an item during the incumbency of the late Attorney General as during that of his successor;—for putting notes to the laws there had been no extravagance practised by the present Officer,—but, on the contrary, his charge for this service last year was less than Mr. Hodgson's in 1849, when the laws were not only fewer in number, but less voluminous in extent,—as may be seen by comparing the laws of 1849 with those of 1852. It is true that Mr. Young's charge for miscellaneous services last year was greater than Mr. Hodgson's had been for a similar period; but the services rendered, it should be borne in mind, were very numerous,—many of them consequent upon the change of government. It has not been shewn, however, that Mr. Young had charged for any particular service a higher fee than his predecessor. In the case of the land tax collection, it is true, he derived greater profits from this source than his predecessor; but the construction evidently put upon the law by the Judges of the Supreme Court,—and the only legitimate construction which the Act will bear,—justified his proceeding by separate informations against the several townships in arrear respectively; but his charge for these informations was not higher, I believe, than what his predecessor had been accustomed to make.—Now I shall address myself, but very briefly, to that branch of the subject which relates to the office I held myself. Properly speaking, the Queen's Printer is not an officer of the Government; he merely enjoys a monopoly of the public printing. Can his charges be commuted for a salary? There is only one way of doing it; but that way would entail heavier expense upon the Government than the present system. If you legalise the Bill, and make the Queen's Printer a responsible Public Officer, you should place him on a level with the other officers of the Government,—provide him with a printing office, stock it with types, presses, paper, stationery, and all the other requirements of a printing office; and give the Queen's Printer a salary, to take charge of it, and superintend the labour, and as a compensation for his skill in the business. But it is manifestly absurd to talk of a salary, when you want the Queen's Printer to provide every thing himself. Now, he is required to keep on hand at all times a large and expensive stock of paper, which may or may not be required for the public service,—if not required, he must make use of it in the best way he can; he is also required to keep a sufficient number of hands employed, to be ready for any emergency. At particular seasons only the whole force may be required on the public printing; they must be employed on private business at other times,—for it would be unsafe to discharge them, as their services might not be attainable when required. The cost for paper, labour, and miscellaneous charges in the Queen's Printer's office last year was over £800; next year, it may be £1000, or perhaps not half the amount. As the prospective work of the office is not ascertainable, so is it impossible to determine what the cost of its management would be. Fixing a salary for the office, therefore, seems to me to be as impracticable and as visionary as it would be for the hon. member for Darnley to say to his tailor—"my good fellow, I have passed a little law of my own, by which I mean to put you on an allowance. You shall make what clothes I require for that sum, and find the materials too." But suppose the hon. member took it into his head to go to Paris, London, or New York, and after admiring the fashions of those places, come back with a passion for fine and expensive dress; so that instead of being content with one coat a year of honest homespun, he should have three of the finest broad cloth and of the newest fashion. In vain, I suppose, would the unfortunate tailor remonstrate, and say that he had double the labour to employ to make the hon. gentleman's clothes—that he incurred heavier and daily increasing expense for materials. Why the hon. member would reply to his remonstrance—"That's the very reason why I cut you down to a fixed amount—I perceived that my custom would be alarmingly on the increase—that you would have more journeymen to employ, and more cloth to cut up; but I can't consent to pay more than I did when you had no such heavy outlay." The hon. member might preach the same agreeable doctrine to his shoemaker, and lay down the same rule for him. In fact I see no reason why he should not extend it into every branch of business;—the shopkeeper should give him what he wanted for so much per annum—the butcher should be put upon a salary, and the blacksmith should shoe horses without number for so many dollars a year—the doctor should give physic and advice, without thinking how many visits he made, or how many children he carried out of the measles and the whooping cough. But in this reciprocal age, the hon. member would be content, I suppose, to submit to this mode of payment himself, when he brought his produce to town. I should like to give him a fixed salary for his butter and eggs, and oatmeal, and flour. What matter if I and others who dealt with him in this way would by and bye have double the number of people to feed that we have now? To be sure he would have to extend the area of his poultry yard, and the limits of his dairy, and add to the number of his farm servants, and sow more oats and wheat, and keep more cattle to work his farm. But he could not consistently complain—he was the first to lay down the wise principle of paying indeterminate and undefinable services by a fixed salary Gentlemen on the other side of the House urge it as a reason for supporting the Bill in its present shape that the expense of the public printing is greatly increased. Of course the total expense must be increased when the labour is about trebled. Look, for example, at the amount of printing now required for some of the departments of the public service. In the Post Office, before the transfer of its management to the Colony, there was hardly any printing to be done beyond a few advertisements in the Gazette. All the blank forms were provided by the General Post Office in England. These blanks are of the most costly description, being generally ruled work. The charge for them, and they are very numerous, has now to be borne by the Colony. Then there are the Custom and Excise Offices. Two years ago there were only four or five such offices; now there are fifteen. The public printing, consequently, for these offices is about trebled. Take again the Road service. There are now 31 Commissioners; formerly there were but 16. The printing for this service is about doubled; whilst several other departments have been added to the public service, and those heretofore in existence have extended their operations, and consequently the labours of the Queen's Printer have been extended likewise. The increase in the total cost of the public printing the last year or two is easily accounted for. First, there was a change of Government, involving a vast variety of miscellaneous printing, such as blank forms of Commissions, Bonds, Licenses, Gazetting of appointments, &c. There were the School Bill and Small Debt Bill—two of the longest Acts that have yet passed the Legislature,—numerous copies of these had to be printed for distribution; and the numerous lengthy Acts of the same Session, occupying a far greater number of printed pages than the Acts of any previous Session, tended materially to swell the expense.—Now with respect to the quotations made from the accounts of the present Queen's Printer, by an hon. member opposite, I cannot say whether those quotations are correctly given, for I have entered into no examination of them. It may be that my accounts differ from Mr. Hazzard's in some minor instances—it may be that in some trifling respects my charges are a trifle higher than his; but I think I could easily shew, as I did in the columns of the Royal Gazette in September last, that Mr. Hazzard's charges upon heavy work, several years back, were considerably higher than mine for the same description of work. His charge, for example, for printing the laws in the Gazette, had been some years as high as 25s. a column, when the columns of his paper were much shorter and narrower than those of the present Gazette. My charge for printing the laws in the Gazette ranged from 12s. 6d. per column to 20s.; never higher than the latter sum; the lower sum was charged when the columns used were about the size of those used in the Gazette in 1841 and '42, when Mr. Hazzard was permitted to make whatever charge he pleased for the public printing; and the higher sum was resorted to only when the laws were printed in small type and very long columns. Again, let us see what have been the charges of the two Queen's Printers for printing the laws in a book or pamphlet form. The hon. member opposite stated that my predecessor had received only £2 9s. per sheet of 8 pages for the laws, and this under contract, whilst my price had been £2 17s. 6d. This statement is not true. The price paid my predecessor was from 50s. to 55s. (for some years the latter sum prevailed), and then he only printed from 150 to 200 copies. I was required to print 400 copies, so that the number would be equal to the number of the Revised Statutes, and my charge for the two hundred or two hundred and fifty additional copies had been from 2s. 6d. to 7s. 6d. per sheet, a difference that would not cover the cost of the blank paper alone. The hon. member states that the pages of Mr. Hazzard's work were longer and broader. Now, if you count the words in the pages printed by him and by myself, you will not find over ten or fifteen words in his favor; whilst in the Schedule pages of last year's laws you will find as many lines in my favour. As to there being a contract with the late Queen's Printer, I repeat it is not true. He was never required to enter into a contract. The hon. member had reference, no doubt, to the printing of the two volumes of revised statutes. They were, indeed, done by contract; but the contractor in this case was Mr. Geo. T. Hazzard, not the Queen's Printer. The Queen's Printer could not decently tender for the work, unless he did so at the rate he charged the Government, viz: from 50s. to 55s. for 200 copies; and as he knew he would have no chance of getting the work at such a rate, he withdrew from competition in the matter, and allowed his son to battle for the job with Mr. Ings. Again, look at the charge which has been made for printing the laws for transmission to England. The Hon. Colonial Secretary stated this evening that my charge for this service had been only about £10, and that Mr. Hazzard's charge the year before had been about £20. Well, the year before last there had been only 34 Acts printed, whilst last year there were 42, including some of the longest ever published; and my charge for printing the 42, in the form alluded to, has been just half as much as Mr. Hazzard charged for printing the 34. Now, Sir, let me call your attention to a few smaller items. It is complained, on the other side, that I charged £1 2s. for advertising and printing the Post Office Proclamation. Perhaps I did. But let the hon. member who finds fault with me on this ground turn to Mr. Hazzard's Account for 1850, and he will find a charge of £1 15s. for printing and advertising a proclamation about the same size,—if any thing, smaller,—respecting Sir Alexander Bannerman's assumption of the Government. In the same year's Account, he will find a charge of 12s 6d. for printing a proclamation proroguing the Legislature; in my Account, the charge for a similar service is 7s. 6d. In the same year's Account, he will find 5s charged for publishing the Governor's assent to certain Bills; in my accounts he will find no such charge at all, though I have rendered the service twice. In Mr. Hazzard's account for 1851, he will find the charge of 15s again made for publishing the Governor's assent to the Acts of the Session. In his account for 1848 there is a charge of 15s for *advertising* once a proclamation respecting Belfast Election. There is no such charge as that in my accounts. In his account for 1849, there is a charge of £3 for printing a form of thanksgiving prayers. My charge for a precisely similar service each of the last two years has been 17s 6d. For advertising official appointments, I believe our charges have been pretty nearly alike: if I have made a charge of 11s 3d for advertising the appointment of twelve magistrates, I can give abundant instances from Mr. Hazzard's accounts where he has exceeded that limit. But let the hon. member opposite, or let the hon. introducer of the Bill now before the House, do as I at first suggested, ask for a Committee of enquiry—let that committee scrutinize my accounts—compare the charges contained in them with those of my predecessor, and I feel satisfied that their report would be greatly in my favour. But thus taking up at random my accounts, or those of my predecessor, can lead to no satisfactory result. "One story is good till another is told," and if members opposite will, forsooth, persist in just picking out such items out of my accounts as may seem to tell against me, I can easily follow their example with regard to Mr. Hazzard's accounts, and throw stone for stone.

MR. CLARK. The principle of the Bill was sufficiently canvassed a few evenings ago; and he had no wish to re-open the discussion upon the question which was then decided: but, as he had not then had an opportunity of replying to the tirade, directed against himself, by the hon. member for the 2d District of King's County (Mr. Whelan,) in the course of the long speech in which he indulged upon that occasion, he hoped he might be permitted to notice it now. That hon. member (Mr. Whelan) then stated that he (Mr. Clark) had been seven years in the Assembly, and that he had never before brought forward a measure. He did not, by any means, pretend to be the brightest member of the House, and neither did he take every opportunity of saying all that he could possibly say upon every question which arose in the House; but still he thought he would not be arrogating too much merit to himself, if he asserted that he had been quite as useful a member of Assembly as the hon. member who had thought proper to twit him with inactivity. That hon. member had indeed spoken of him in a most unseemly and unjustifiable manner. Had such an attack been made upon him, by a member of the opposition, he would not have been surprised or annoyed at it. But, when such a tirade was causelessly directed against him by a member of his own party—by a member of the Government too, of which he had always been one of the most steady and consistent supporters, he had certainly abundant reason to feel himself, as he did, much grieved. If a member of Assembly could, at any time, claim consideration, at the hands of a government, for the steady and conscientious support which he had given them, he (Mr. Clark) felt himself to be in such a position; for he had even supported a Bill brought in by a member of the Government, although he knew that his constituents would conceive themselves to be injuriously affected by it, and would, in all probability, manifest their serious displeasure towards him on that account. If he had acted deceitfully towards the Government; if he had only, in any way, given them reason to believe that he had accorded them a hollow support, he might have expected to be contemptuously spoken of and insulted by them. But, on the contrary, when no considerations of risk to himself had ever induced him even to hesitate, as to the wisdom and propriety of offending them, his open and direct support, towards the carrying of any of the important popular measures which they had originated; it could not be denied that, if he should even differ from them, on minor questions, he was, at the least, intitled to their courteous and respectful forbearance; and not to be assailed with unsparing acrimony, as if he were a determined and malignant enemy. So far was he from having brought forward his Bill in a spirit of enmity to the hon. the Queen's Printer, that he had moved in the matter as his friend. He was aware that many, (ignorant of the extent to which the business in the office of the Queen's Printer had, of late, increased,) imagined, on hearing and seeing references made to the sums of money paid to him, for his services, by the Government, that his charges must be enormously high—much greater certainly than those of his predecessor; and his object was to take into account the increased amount of business, and, if possible, to establish a basis or criterion on which to act, or by which to be guided in establishing a fixed salary for all the services performed for the Government in that Office; so that, whilst the Officer should be sufficiently remunerated, the people should, at the same time, be satisfied that no more than a fair allowance was made for the public services performed in the Office. In reference, however, to the contemptuous and disparaging language towards himself, which, it would appear, the hon. the Queen's Printer had thought the course pursued by him (Mr. Clark), in seeking, by the Bill then before the Committee to free him from the suspicions which unfortunately attached to him concerning his charges, in the minds of some, had justified,—he (Mr. Clark) would only further observe that that language, in some particulars, was so unwarranted and ungentlemanly that, had it proceeded from any other, he would not have borne with it. With respect to the charges made for public printing, not only by the present Queen's Printer, but by his predecessor in office, it was very well known that they were, and had been much complained of, on account of what was considered their extravagance, in the country. Both, indeed, had been so much complained of, on that account that he could not himself undertake to say which of them was considered most extravagant and most blameable by the country. The increase in the amounts charged for public printing, within the last two years, was, however, alarming; and, on looking over the items of those accounts, it was quite plain that, whether the rates were higher than those which formerly regulated such charges, some of them ought not to have been made; as for instance, the printing of prayers to be used in public thanksgiving—and the posting of notices when the publication of a proclamation in the Gazette was all that was required. It was, however, right that he should give Mr. Whelan credit for having abandoned that practice. He (Mr. Clark) found fault with such charges last year; and he was gratified to find that they were now abandoned. In attempting to shew the propriety, if not indeed the necessity, of fixing a salary, on a proper scale, for the Queen's Printer, he (Mr. Clark) was far from intending to cast any reflections upon the Government; but it would surely be admitted that the placing of that Officer in such a position, with respect to a fair remuneration for his public services, that it should be secured to him without his having to sit in the Executive Council, as an auditor of his own accounts, would be desirable arrangement; and, if it were admitted to be a desirable and proper in the case of the Queen's Printer, the same considerations would shew it to be equally so in that of the Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN. The hon. member who had just sat down had accused him of having made use of ungentlemanly language to him, in debate, a few evenings ago, and of having made him the subject of abuse and invidious comparisons. He had a perfect recollection of all that he said on the occasion alluded to by the hon. member (Mr. Clark); but he was quite at a loss to determine how that gentleman had been able to put upon it a construction so offensive to himself as he had done; for he (Hon. Mr. Whelan) certainly could not plead guilty to any part of the accusation. The comparisons which he made were, he thought at the time, and he thought so still, the most suitable which he could have employed to shew the absurdity of seeking to remunerate a public officer, for indeterminate and unlimited services, by a fixed salary; and the offence which the hon. member had taken at them could, in his (Hon. Mr. Whelan's) opinion, have originated in nothing but a misapprehension of their significance and bearing. If any thing however which he (Hon. Mr. W.) said upon that occasion was at all calculated to give the hon. member offence, it must have been his (Hon. Mr. W's) pointing out the lameness and imperfection of the measure, as altogether unsustained, on his (Mr. Clark's) part, by either facts or figures, and his being, in his helplessness, apparently obliged to abandon its advocacy to his own political opponents, and entrust it to the protection of those who, he well knew, were actuated by strong feelings against the two individuals whose private interests the measure was designed to affect. The hon. member had made allusion to the circumstance of his (Hon. Mr. W.) being in the Executive Council, and there auditing his own accounts. A similar observation was made the other evening by the hon. member for Charlottetown (Mr. Longworth); but he would now beg to tell both gentlemen that the Queen's Printer had no more to do with the auditing of his accounts, as an Executive Councillor, than they themselves had. In fact, his accounts never came under his notice in the Council. They were always referred to a Committee for examination, and very closely scrutinised by that Committee before they were certified.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The hon. member (Mr. Whelan) had said, but surely with little reason, that the introduction of the Bill was calculated to injure the professional character of the Queen's Printer and of the Attorney General. Such reasoning was really ridiculous. It might as well have been said, at the time when a Bill was introduced to establish Salaries for the Colonial Secretary and the Treasurer, that the measure was a direct attack upon the official characters of the gentlemen who, at that time, held those appointments; but no person was so absurd as to do so. He (Mr. Montgomery) thought that it was quite competent to the House to take up the question, and after due enquiry, to establish salaries both for the Queen's Printer and the Attorney General—the amount of the Salaries to have due reference to the amount of work to be performed, or business to be transacted in the office of the one or the other; and he was also persuaded that due regard to the public interests demand such an investigation and settlement on the part of the House. With respect to the determining of the amount of salary which ought, in fairness, to be paid to the Attorney General, he thought the House would have very few difficulties to overcome. It might easily be determined, in a just and satisfactory manner, by taking the average of the fees of that office, for the last three or four years. And although it might not be quite so easy, with due regard to justice, to commute the charges of the Queen's Printer for a Salary, on the same principle; it would, he thought, be no very difficult matter to establish a scale, by which his charges should be so far regulated, in the matters of particulars and rates, as to do away with any apprehension of their being unduly, at least to any material extent, increased in future. It was certainly very unfair to taunt, and reflect upon the hon. member (Mr. Clark) who had introduced the Bill, and to hint his being actuated by any but the most creditable motives; on the contrary he (Mr. M.) thought every person capable of forming an impartial judgment respecting his conduct, in that particular, must be of opinion that he had only done his duty to the country, and instead of being held worthy of censure, he was entitled to the thanks of the people for the fair and independent manner in which he had brought the question before the House.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member for the Second District of King's County (Hon. Mr. Whelan) had not spoken, with reference to the object of the Bill, either as it would have become him to speak as a representative of the people, or as if he were influenced, in the matter, by a due regard for the public interests. He had, on the contrary, spoken only in the character of the Queen's Printer, and, apparently, as if swayed by no other consideration, than a regard for his official and private interests. Many of the observations in which that hon. gentleman had indulged, and applied to the hon. member (Mr. Clark) who had introduced the Bill, might well have been spared. He (Hon. Mr. Whelan) might excel in his talent for ridicule; but he (Mr. Davies) could safely, he believed, assure him that, with the majority of his present auditory, mere irony or sarcasm, especially with reference to questions of public economy, would not be allowed to pass for sound argument. No man of sound and impartial judgment could examine the statements of the Attorney General's and Queen's Printer's accounts, without being startled by their amount. The charges made by the Attorney General were very high and the frequency and amount of the items were sufficient to alarm any member of the Assembly who had any regard for public economy. The gross amount too of the various sums already paid to the Queen's Printer for public printing, for the short time, less than two years, which he had been in office—already over £1200—was sufficient to shew the necessity of some regulations, by which the public expenditure, in that department, might be kept within proper and something like economical bounds. Instead of censure, the hon. member from Darnley (Mr. Clark) was, most undoubtedly deserving of much credit for having brought the Bill forward in its present form. Nay more, he (Mr. Davies) would not hesitate to say that it was creditable, not only to the majority of the House, but to the Government—six members of which sat in that majority—that such measures should be brought forward from that side of the House. With the hon. member who had last spoken (Mr. Montgomery), he agreed that it would be a very easy business equitably to determine the amount of salary for which the fees of the Attorney General ought to be commuted; and that a scale of rates might, almost as easily, be agreed upon, by which the charges of the Queen's Printer might be regulated and, to a certain extent, limited.

Hon. Mr. COLES. He had no objection whatever to make to the proposition for establishing a salary in lieu of the fees paid to the Attorney General, by the Government, on behalf of the public; and neither did he think that it would be at all difficult to establish its equitable amount. The Attorney General had no extra services to perform; and, in many points of view, his appointment was a much more desirable one than any other under the Government. His official duties were principally confined to his management of Crown prosecutions or cases; and he (Hon. Mr. Coles) did not think that his discharge of those duties occupied him for more than three months of the year. The rest of his time was at his own disposal; and he was not, on account of his holding the office of Attorney General, debarred like the other chief Public officers, from prosecuting his private professional business, or, in fact, from engaging for his own advantage, in speculations even of another kind. With the office of Queen's Printer, however, it was quite different: the amount of work to be performed in it could not be so far ascertained as to render it possible to determine, with due regard to justice on both sides, the precise amount which ought annually to be paid for public services in that department.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN. In seeking equitably to determine the amount of annual Salary which ought to be paid to the Attorney General, by the Government, for his official services, the chief consideration ought not, in his (Hon. Mr. W's) opinion, to be the amount of time which he would have, annually, to devote to the proper discharge of those duties. That consideration would afford but a very insufficient basis on which to determine the question. The amount of fair remuneration could not be determined independently of a just consideration of the amount of study—the days, nights, and years of close and toilsome study, attended perhaps, by a large consequent expenditure of money—which it must have cost to qualify a man for the proper discharge of the duties of so high and responsible an office as that of Attorney General: and neither ought it to be forgotten that the holding of so high and important an office invests its incumbent with a certain dignity, the due preservation of which subjects him to the maintenance of a style of living with which, in a more private station, he might, with propriety, dispense. As to the lecture which the hon. member for Belfast had thought fit to deliver, he would only say of it that he would have been glad to think it had been as beneficial to the House in general, as it had, no doubt, been agreeable to the hon. member for Darnley (Mr. Clark), for whose behoof it was delivered; but with regard to himself (Mr. W.) he felt quite unable to appreciate the wisdom or propriety of the hon. member's admonitions. But, with regard to the hon. member's (Mr. Davies estimate of the gross amounts paid to the present Queen's Printer since he came into office, he could tell the hon. member, and prove it too, by reference to the Journals, that no such amount as that of £1900 had been paid to the Queen's Printer for the period named. Perhaps the hon. member would be nearer the truth if he included in his statement the cost of printing the Journals for the House of Assembly, which is a very considerable item in the public printing. He (Mr. W.) had no doubt the hon. member for Belfast meant that *all* the printing had cost the amount mentioned by him. As to his observation that he (hon. Mr. W.) had spoken more in the character of Queen's Printer than that of a representative of the people, he would only reply, that he believed he did not come there to receive lessons in wisdom or in parliamentary usage from the hon. member for Belfast; but if he (Mr. W.) did speak some what warmly in defence of his character as Queen's Printer, he did no more than what every other man would do under the circumstances he only defended his official character when that character was grossly impugned.

MR. CLARK. Mr. Hazzard's charges had, formerley, been declared, by certain parties, to be enormous; and yet now all that could be said in favour of those which were made by his successor in office, was that, in most cases, they were as moderate as those of his predecessor. As to the Attorney General's charges, they were evidently excessive when compared with the amount of duty he had to perform on account of them. By reference to the Journals, it would appear that, in one year, he had received, on account of Crown Prosecutions, and for examining the laws and preparing the marginal references to them, upwards of £437: that was for services which, from their amount, it was pretty clear could not have occupied him for quite three months out of the twelve. There was certainly a great and most unreasonable disproportion between the remuneration allowed to the Attorney General for his services, and what was allowed to some other public officers for theirs. For instance the Colonial Secretary and the Treasurer had each an annual salary of only £400; and yet the duties of their offices were such as to require their constant attendance upon them; and neither of them could embark in any private business whilst retaining his office; yet the Attorney General, who received upwards of £437, for about three months' services, was, at the same time, at full liberty to prosecute his profession privately, and to engage in other lucrative speculations. He had, until it was known that he was to bring this Bill forward in its present form, been upon what he considered pretty good terms with Mr. Young but, since then, he (Mr. Young) had, when they had accidently met, treated him with great coolness. Perhaps that gentleman and the honourable member, the Queen's Printer, thought they could frown him down; but he could tell them that neither the affectation of cool hauteur on the part of the one, nor the ready and sarcastic irony of the other, would deter him from pursuing what he conceived to be the path of his public duty.

Mr. WHITEMAN. He had never been, and he never would be an advocate for the reduction of the Salaries of public officers, to the lowest figure indicated by the niggardly scale of political parsimony. The services of the Attorney General did not, however, vary much from year to year; and, he thought that, without the least injustice or unfairness to the gentleman now acting in that capacity, the House might agree to