

pressed on this subject in the Patrons' platform, or, at all events, look on it as a view which might be accepted. I shall, therefore, state the principal reasons why the Government has not hitherto advised the change now proposed. These reasons, and the facts bearing on them, do not appear to be generally understood. I do not anticipate any ultimate divergence of opinion between the Reform Government and the Reform party in the future, as there has not been any in the past. (Applause.) Meanwhile let our reasons for what we have done, and for what we have refrained from doing, receive from all concerned the consideration to which these reasons may be entitled. (Hear, hear.)

LOCAL ELECTION OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.

The article on the subject in the Patrons' platform does not deal with details, and it is understood that Patrons are not yet agreed as to whether the change should be to election by the County Council, or by direct vote of the municipal electors of the county. As regards the individual members of the Order, I am told that some are for making the change applicable only as vacancies occur, and not so as to affect present incumbents who have been efficient officers and been guilty of no wrong; that some would cancel all existing appointments without exception; that some would limit the change to officials not connected with the administration of justice; that some would confine the change to Registrars and Sheriffs, though the Sheriff is connected with the administration of justice; that some would have the elected officials to hold office for five years; that some are for a shorter term; and that some desire to have the elected officers hold their offices during good behavior, as in practice the officials have done hitherto, and as in practice municipal Treasurers and Clerks also do. I do not discuss any of these details at present, though the assent or dissent of many may depend on the nature and extent of the change proposed or contemplated. I have elsewhere expressed the opinion that election by direct vote at the polls would be better than election by the County Councils, if the choice were between these two methods only.

The question of the mode of choosing the officials does not itself involve the question, whether the proper or best mode of remunerating them is by fees or salary—as to which I shall speak later on. Nor does it involve the question as to the fitting amount of their remuneration. As to that, I only observe that if the present statutory reductions should be thought to leave any of the incomes too large, any further reduction may be either by exacting for public uses a larger percentage of their receipts than now, or by the other method of funding the fees and paying fixed salaries. The official incomes may be reduced in either of these ways, whatever should be the mode of choosing the men.

ELECTION OF OFFICIALS BY THE PEOPLE AT THE POLLS.

1. It is sometimes asked why, as the body of electors are qualified to choose members of Parliament, they are not equally qualified to elect the Registrars and other Provincial local officers also? And the question is sometimes thought to be conclusive. But it is not so. The case of shareholders in a banking company, or other large joint stock company, illustrates the difference. The shareholders choose the directors, and they leave to the directors the selection of the officers of the company. No one questions that this method of management is in the interest of the companies; it is for this reason that the system is universally adopted. So, under the school law, the people choose the school trustees, the trustees choose the teachers. Under the municipal law, the people choose the members of the Council, but the Council choose the municipal Treasurer and Clerk, the assessors, collectors, and other officers.