

an example;* and the reduction of expense would be of the highest importance to Lower Canada, upon thus first setting up as it were, to keep house for herself.

You will likewise have remarked, that a proposal is going

* "Alas, my friend, you try in vain to
Impossibilities to gain."

Such examples of disinterestedness have sometimes been set but have never been followed. What effect had the noble sacrifice made by the Marquis of Camden some years ago, when he gave up the enormous emoluments he derived from his sinecure place of teller of the exchequer? Did one of the many placemen, and holders of sinecure offices, follow his example? Not one! This is a recent occurrence, in every one's recollection: I can call to mind only one other. Sir Harry Vane, in Cromwell's time, being then treasurer of the navy, stated in parliament, that the profits of his office, were too great for any one person; during such distress and calamity of the commonwealth, and desired that a convenient salary might be appropriated to him, out of them, and the rest go towards the charges of the war. But he too stood alone, none other did the like. In 1699 indeed, we are informed by a parliamentary speech of Sir Charles Sedley, in a debate on the *civil list*, that a general reduction of their emoluments, was once offered, by all the men in office. But take it as he relates it.

"The late proposal of the courtiers themselves, to save the King's money; was by applying the profits, salaries, and fees, of their places, that exceed £800 per annum, to the war. This offer, sir, as I remember, began when an observation was made by you of the *long accounts*, and that a great part of the king's revenue, remained in the hands of the receivers; to which a worthy member answered; it could not be helped, by reason some receivers were members of parliament, and stood upon their privileges. To which, another member answered, that we could not deprive members of their privileges, but that, to remedy the like, for the future, we were ready to pass a vote, that no member of the parliament should be a receiver of the king's revenue. This alarmed the whole body of the men in office, so that some stood up, and to prevent the house from harping upon that string, said, they so little valued their own profit, that they were willing to resign all their fees, salaries, and perquisites, exceeding £800 per ann. towards the next year's charge. This, if really intended, was very generous; but if it was only a compliment, shift, or expedient, to avoid the present vote we were upon, that no member of parliament should be a receiver of the revenue, nothing was more disingenuous; nor could a greater abuse be offered to the house, for we pro-