

state of New York, with a population of six and a half millions, pays the governor a salary of \$10,000, with a residence, whereas Canada, with our population of under five millions, pays nearly \$50,000.

Nor is that an isolated case. I have in my hand a schedule, which I have taken from the World's Almanac, of 1895, page 353—and I have no doubt the figures are accurate—showing that the state of Pennsylvania, with a population of 5,258,000, about half a million more than that of Canada, only pays \$10,000 a year to its governor. It looks to me as if the whole scheme of Government in Canada, as represented by costly Governors-General, Lieutenant-Governors, and Cabinet Ministers, were founded upon too liberal a scale. For example, in the United States Government there are but eight heads of departments, each of whom is paid a salary of \$8,000 a year, or a total of \$64,000.

IN CANADA WE HAVE MINISTERS AND DEPARTMENTS GALORE.

Eleven Ministers drawing \$8,000 a year each, one drawing \$9,000, and three Controllers, together drawing \$18,000; in other words, the executive heads of our Government cost us \$115,000 a year, as against \$64,000 a year, payable to the corresponding heads of departments in the United States. In other words, we are paying about 80 per cent. more in the way of salaries to the members of our Government, than are paid to the members of the United States Government. I mention that as a further illustration of the extravagant scale upon which our Government was formed. I shall be told, no doubt, that on a former occasion, the Parliament of Canada passed a Bill reducing the salary of the Governor-General to \$35,000 a year, and that the Bill was disallowed by the Imperial authorities; and, I suppose, it will be argued that there is no reason to hope for better success should Parliament now repeat, in an aggravated form, as my opponents might say, the proposition it made before. It is true that in 1868 the Imperial authorities did see fit to disallow that Bill;

BUT WHAT THEY DID IN 1868,

when confederation had only been a year or so in existence, is no test of what they ought to do after confederation has been in existence for over a quarter of a century. They had a right to suppose in 1868, that this country would expand in wealth and population to such a degree, as perhaps to enable us to pay these expenses without feeling them. Therefore, I assume that the liberal scale of remuneration adopted at the commencement, was adopted under a mistaken idea, and perhaps with a more hopeful expectation as to the growth of our country than has been realized. But whatever may have been the reason,

THE FACT STARES US IN THE FACE,

that this original salary of \$48,000 is only about half of what the office costs us now. So that even if some hon. gentlemen insist on maintaining the salary at the figure fixed in the Confederation Act, they cannot justify the expenditures which have grown up and become attached to the office within the last twenty-five years. It is not intended by the