

ture—which we are not, but advocating also and chiefly annexation which would involve retrenchment as a ruinor, yet important reform—we would affirm the opinion that England, whilst she holds Canada as a Colony, should defray out of the Imperial Exchequer and not out of Colonial funds, the expense of the Civil Secretary's Office, and the Governor General's salary besides. But we do not insist upon this reform here because nothing short of annexation will satisfy us; and we should consider it a loss of time to advocate minor reforms, which the GREAT MOVEMENT is sure to carry along with it.

Next, let us compare the expense of our Provincial Secretary's Department with that of their Secretary of State—the two Departments being similar in their nature and duties. Our department we find costs—\$18,424 \pounds annum; theirs costs \$7,000 \pounds per annum; whilst at the same time, be it remembered, our population is a million and a half, and theirs is three millions. In other words, ours costs about 12 cents per head, while theirs costs less than quarter of a cent per head!

Reader, is the contrast sufficiently marked to satisfy you that our system is extravagant to a degree beyond endurance?

The next on the list for comparison is our President of the Executive Council. He and his clerks get \$11,388 \pounds annum of our public money; a pretty fair share of plunder, we conceive, for occupying a post which, so far as we can see, has no specific duties attached to it. Against this officer and his staff we are really at a loss to find an offset in our neighbour's system. They can only be compared to the fifth wheel of a coach; an absurdity which our neighbours are not likely to commit.

We come now to our Attornies General East and West and the contingencies of their departments, and a clerk to boot for Mr. Attorney General East. The whole expense amounts to \$11,600 \pounds annum. Against this enormous sum we have no offset in the system of our neighbours. Their Attornies General are working lawyers and their place is found as it should be under the head of "the Judiciary." Our Attornies General on the other hand are comparative sinecurists—they do not condescend to conduct the law business of the Province—but merely sit in Council with mock-monarchical dignity giving our Governor (at \$31,111 a year) advice at the rate of \$11,600 a year. Comment upon this flagitious extravagance is surely unnecessary. But we may be allowed to ask, can we wonder with such facts before us at the amount of loyalty and attachment to British connexion, which now exists where it would not have been looked for a few years ago—or at the new-born zeal exem-

plified in Militia dismissals and the persecution for opinion's sake, which distinguishes the Government of the day?

But to proceed with our comparison. Our Inspector General and his clerks next command our attention. The expense of this functionary and his department is \$16,336 a year, against which we set the expense of the Comptroller, Deputy Comptroller and Clerks of the State of New York, which amounts to \$10,800 \pounds annum—the nearest approach to an equality which we have yet found, but still showing a balance against us of upwards of \$5,000. Then comes our Receiver General and his clerks; against whom we offset the Treasurer of the State of New York and clerks. Our department costs \$8,088; theirs \$4,000 \pounds annum—something less than half.

Then we have a department of Public Works at \$8,000 for salaries only; against which we place their Canal Commissioners and Clerks at \$9,000 \pounds annum—the only instance in which departments at all analogous in their nature are found to exceed ours in cost. But let it be remembered that the Works which our Board superintendents afford only about \$160,000 \pounds annum, whilst the Works superintended by the Canal Commissioners yield upwards of \$2,750,000 \pounds annum.

Reader, we will not take up more of your time in dissecting and comparing our tables. We have led the way and will leave the rest to yourself. The Judiciary and Legislative tables will well repay the trouble of an attentive examination. The first will show you that we pay \$18,784 for 23 Judges, whilst they pay only \$125,800 for 45 Judges. By their system justice is speedy and comparatively cheap; by ours it is tardy and dear. There the Judges are the people's choice; here the Judge is too frequently a ruined politician, a man who has stepped from the Executive Chamber to the Bench, saddling the country with his services at £1,000 a year for life, when the people were on the eve of dispensing with his services in every shape. The system, you will see, is bad, and must in the end lead to corruption and inefficiency, where talent, industry and integrity are most required.

The point of retrenchment cannot be dwelt on too forcibly. The Inspector General of Accounts is reported to have stated on a late occasion that retrenchment to any great extent is impossible. The admission is a condemnation of our system. Let us have the elective system of our neighbours, and your public servants will be forced to cut down their exorbitant salaries. Then we shall secure economy and efficient servants and retrenchment will follow as surely as the sun sets to rise again.

CA
Governor
Civil Sec
Clerks, (5
Provincia
Clerks En
" W
President
Clerks, (3
Attorney
conting
Attorney
conting
Do.
Inspector
Clerks, (3
Statistic
Registrat
Clerks, (3
Receiver
Clerks, (3
Public
Secreta

S De
average
average
Shout
tion, S

Upper
Jud
Ch

Lower
Jud
i

den
Allow

Solic
Pens