law at defiance and might lead to consequences disastrous to the welfare of the County. What has the sinking fund to do with speculation in debentures? Should it not be left intact for the purposes intended?

We are sorry to find that the Treasurer has transgressed the law in the misappropriation of the Sinking Fund and that the Council incur a greater share of responsibility by sanctioning any such misappropriation. Like the case of the Toronto bank, the Treasurer has employed his influence to induce the Council to invest the Sinking Fund in the purchase of County Debentures on the plea of such investment being of advantage to the County. But we have no doubt that instead of this being the case it is the *few* at the expense of the many that are benefitted.

We find that the Warden is severely to blame for neglecting to act upon the instruction of the Finance Committee to apply for the sanction of the Governor in Council before touching the Sinking Fund. This would give him an air of excuse but instead of having any misgivings on the legality of the huckstering in Debentures, he urged the Treasurer to enter into the business with vigour and prosecute it with zeal.

The eighth charge is, That the Debentures purchased by the Treasurer were not obtained at the then Market value but purchased at a greater rate, the County thus sustaining a loss.

We consider the purchase of the Debentures injurious to the interests of the County for several reasons. Taking into account the probable influx of population into the County and the time to run, with the high prices paid for the Debentures, and the difficulty of raising money. It is unjust towards the people, and prevents others from taking their share in the payment of the expenses left on the County.

The same description of securities that were purchased at seven per cent discount were sold during the year at twenty per cent discount, the County thus sustaining a loss even if the sale and purchase were legal in other respects.

In addition to the previous charges, we are of opinion that the salaries paid the County Officers for the year 1856 were illegal, the By-Law (No. 15) sanctioning the payment not being retrospective. The answer to question 23 is in our opinion an evasion; and the opinion of the Treasurer as expressed in answer to question 29 is not borne out by the wording of said By-Law; because the "plain and obvious meaning" of the By Law we conceive to be *prospective*, and not *retrospective*. Hence to receive the salaries sanctioned by it, back for eleven months before its passage is illegal.

We are of opinion that it is the duty of the Treasurer to give a clear and correct statement of the finances of the County on the 31st of December every year, and that the sums due from the different Municipalities (if any) should be set down in the Accounts, in order that the people will have an opportunity at the proper time of receiving a *true* and not a fictitious Annual Statement. We are also of opinion that the accredited records of the County ought to be filed and deposited in the Clerk's office, and that the parties that neglected this legal duty have rendered themselves amenable to law. In fine we are of opinion that the appropriation of special Funds to other purposes is illegal, as in the case of the Lunatic Asylum Fund which was devoted to an object for which it was never intended.

We append a communication on this point received from one of the most eminent Counsel in the Province, Adam Wilson, Esq., Q.C., to which we bespeak the careful perusal of the public.

We have now placed before the public a careful statement of the results of the investigation into the condition of the County Finances. [illegible] we have [illegible] We have [illegible] our actions have been prompted by motives as favourable to the Council and