

attempt to fill the blank with a larger sum than sixteen hundred dollars.

Mr. DABBIT.—I quite agree with all that has been said with regard to the office of Receiver General not being political, and when I heard that it was intended to be so, I tried to get the Bill, but it could not be found. It seems however, that it was taken away to make this most beneficial change. I hope it will be so arranged that this officer will receive not only the amounts coming from Canada, but our own Export Duty. On referring to the Auditor's Report, I see that large amounts are lying back in the hands of the Deputy Treasurers year after year. That is something I don't believe in, and I hope this officer will see that the amounts received by them shall be promptly and fully paid up. I am satisfied that £400 will be an ample salary to pay a man for the duties required of him, and that plenty of good men can be found who would gladly take it at that sum, and ask for no clerk. It is much better to put the sum as small as possible, for it is very easy to increase it if found insufficient; but if it is made large at first, it will be found very difficult to cut it down afterwards. It seems to me that in all these things we are inclined to commence too big. There is, however, one department that I consider is not sufficiently paid, and that is, the Postmasters at some of the larger offices, who, though their duties are much heavier than this officer's will be, don't get anywhere near £400, and I therefore think the Receiver General should not get over that sum.

Mr. CHANDLER.—It is admitted on every side that an office of this kind is necessary, and while the hon. members have been speaking, I have been turning in my mind what salary such an officer should receive. Does the duty require much thought or mental ability? No, sir, it is not an office like that of Attorney General, where large attainments are requisite, but merely one in which transactions of an ordinary kind are carried on, and under these circumstances I think that £400 will be amply sufficient. The country abounds with men who will gladly do the duty for that sum.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.—There is one element in the Bill that I wish to explain. The Government do not want to make a big salary, but the Bill is only of a temporary character, and that question will best be settled at the next Session, when it is known exactly what is required of this officer. After seven months or so the House can decide as to the permanency of the salary at the sum named. If the office were made political it would be worth double the amount than if non-political. But hon. members are astray somewhat with regard to the salaries of

United States officials. Why, a short time ago, General Banks was made President of a Railroad, owned by a private Company, with a salary of ten thousand dollars; and a man who had been engaged in a public office all his life, died a short time ago worth seventy thousand dollars. A friend of mine asked a gentleman there how he had managed to say so much. "Oh," he replied, "he was very economical." It is apparent that if the salary they get is small, they are yet able to live well and become wealthy.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT.—I am one that believes the greatest economy should be practiced, with due regard to efficiency. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Babbitt) has said that plenty of men can be got for £400 a year, and no clerk allowed. Now, even if the Province be reduced to a municipality, I do not think the Receiver General should be paid less than the Chamberlain of the City of Saint John. The Common Council pay Mr. Ruel £400, and he has an office and a clerk allowed him besides. I very much doubt if it would be desirable to have no clerk, for there are many times when persons would want to go to the office when the Receiver General could not be there. When it was proposed to decrease the salaries of the Deputy Treasurers, I opposed it, but it was carried, and what has been the result? Why since that time there have been very heavy defalcations, which was not the case before. The Receiver General will be required to give very heavy bonds, and ought to be a good man, and when clerks in private business can get £300, I think this officer should not get less than £500. Hon. members have spoken about officials in the United States. Why, it is well known that that Government is the most expensive in the world. There they go in for the spoils, every man trying to get as much as he can while in office; the officials of the City of New York, it is well known, are paid the most extravagant amounts, and it is useless to draw a comparison between their system and ours.

Mr. KERR.—I think if £400 is found to be too low, it can very easily be raised. The giving of large salaries does not always have the effect of making men do their work more thoroughly; nor is it among those that receive good, fair, remunerative salaries that defalcations so frequently occur as with those whose salaries are very large. There was the Postmaster of the United States, who received a very large salary, went off with some millions of dollars of the public funds, and the Collector of the City of New York, which is considered one of their best offices, did the same thing. Because the City of Saint John

chose to pay their Chamberlain £400 is no reason why we should give our Receiver General £500. We know that the duties of the Presidents of Banks are much more onerous than the Receiver Generalship will be, and yet they only received, till lately £400 a year. I think that sum quite sufficient to pay for the duties to be performed, but he should be provided with a clerk. It is not necessary that his salary should be large, but one will be required. I do not think the office should be united with that of the Provincial Secretary, for he as Provincial and Financial Secretary will have quite enough to do; but now that the Post Office is removed the Auditor will have much less to do—only the school and bye road accounts to look after—and it might possibly be added to that. The bye road accounts, I think, should be audited in the various localities where the money is expended, as it can there be done much more efficiently than at a remote distance. On this matter, however, I think that £400 is quite adequate for an accomplished and efficient officer.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.—I move the blank be filled with \$2,000.

Mr. BECKWITH.—I move, in amendment, that it be filled with \$1,600. If we become wealthy, as the Provincial Secretary has predicted, it will be very easy to add another £100 to it. The duties require to be performed promptly and efficiently, but \$1,600 is quite sufficient and as much as we can now afford to pay. One clerk at about \$600 salary will be plenty, and many will be glad to get the situation who are thoroughly capable of performing the duty. I do not think this office should be united with any other. The Auditor's duties will be much lighter in the future, as they should be, for that officer has been very much overworked. I think the idea of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Kerr) is good, respecting the auditing of the bye road accounts in the localities where the moneys are expended, for during the past year in the office frauds were known to have been practised, but it was so far off that they could not be well looked into. I think the Financial Secretary and Auditor might very well be now united in one individual, with one clerk to assist him.

Hon. Mr. McADAM.—I want to ask the hon. member from Northumberland (Mr. Kerr) if he will accept the office of Receiver General, with a salary of £400? If he will, I am sure I will vote for him, for no one could be obtained who would perform the duties better, or give more satisfaction to the country.

Mr. KERR.—I am not in a position to talk about the salary I should require until I get the offer of the situation—(Laughter.)