

entered into by the Provincial Parliament for the lifetime of the reigning Sovereign, imparts to the scale of salaries now subsisting, a character of permanency which can hardly be expected to attach to any fresh adjustment.

4. It was indeed affirmed in some of the statements laid before the Committee of the Legislative Assembly, that lower salaries are awarded under the local Governments of the States forming the American Union, and the allegation is, undoubtedly, to a certain extent, true. The nominal salaries affected to offices even of the highest grade in many cases under these Governments, are so inconsiderable, as to place them beyond the reach of persons who have not independent means of subsistence, whether derived from realized estate, professional pursuits, or the profits of trade. A smaller income, for example, attaches to the office of Governor in some of the more wealthy and densely-peopled States, than is usually assigned to the same office in territories.

5. The evidence on this head submitted to the Committee was, however, scanty, and as the witnesses were not subjected to the ordeal of cross-examination, of little value as a guide in the determination of the questions which it raised. No information, for instance, was given as to the extent to which the practice of payment of fees, which has been in a great measure abandoned in Canada since the Union, obtains in the States to which reference was made. No inquiries were instituted with the view of ascertaining how far the prospect of future and more lucrative employment under the Federal Government, or even the hope of obtaining the advantages attaching to the situation of Member of Congress, may induce persons of talent and character to assume temporarily in the several States, the discharge of official functions which are inadequately remunerated. Nor was any light thrown on the yet more important question as to whether experience has proved that very low salaries contribute to official purity or to the interests of public economy.

6. It is in truth no very easy matter to compare the cost of Government in communities which are governed on widely different systems; and a comparison of this nature, if it is to lead to any good or useful result, ought manifestly to be conducted in a very candid and philosophical spirit. To assume that the State Government perform for the people of the States the same services as the Colonial Government renders the people of Canada, without enquiring whether or not this be indeed the case, is obviously a very hasty and unsatisfactory mode of disposing of the question, and even a cursory examination of the facts suffices to demonstrate its fallacy. It is easy to perceive, on the one hand, that our system of Colonial Government, as it is worked out here, gives to the colonists a more complete control over their own affairs, and imposes, therefore, on this Government duties of administration greatly more extensive and complicated than is conferred by the Constitution of the United States on any member of the Confederacy in its individual capacity. In proof of this, it may be enough to cite the multifarious functions connected with the imposition and collection of duties from customs, the regulation of internal posts, and the management and sale of vast extents of unoccupied territory, which devolve on the Colonial Government, but from the performance of which the local Governments of the Union are relieved by the Federal authority. To this enumeration may be added certain departments of criminal administration which do not fall within the cycle of the attributions of the State officials. A remarkable instance of the working of their system in this branch was afforded lately, when the authorities of the State of New York refused to be parties to carrying out the provisions of the Treaty of Extradition which had passed between Great Britain and the United States, alleging that it devolved on the officers of the Federal Government alone to give effect to it.

7. On the other hand, the great extent to which the principle of decentralization is carried under the system of the United States withdraws from the State Governments all controul over many branches of local administration, for the right conduct of which the Colonial Government is, with us, held to be more or less directly responsible. Add to these remarkable discrepancies the facts, that the entire separation of legislative and executive functions in the Constitution of the General and Local Govern-