

Law Fees  
e, net, £1,  
special funds  
res, School  
ates, Indian,  
m, Montreal  
y have yield-  
or 1855 the  
ne collection  
Works £58,  
; Fines, &c.  
most new offi-  
such that the  
in 1854 was  
re in the leg-  
que upon a

into—a plain  
ree thousand  
at four times  
as was to vote  
new Custom  
bring the two  
duties was  
\$1,314,456—  
n at Quebec,  
\$20,904 were  
ger sum into  
as at the Que-  
728, in 1853,  
The salaries  
9, in 1853, to  
have enough

ned Abraham  
horse waggon  
1854, Ham-  
ument, the  
antford paid  
£9,222; cost  
expense of

aid in £1419,  
n's collected  
to the officers!  
cted, leaving  
at sharp con-  
bundred and  
er.") charges  
d—Nor one  
Philipsburg,  
ngdon, Am-  
uskij collect-  
£3,101, or  
Canada, as  
ne has been

### TRICK.

uits whom  
rich Austria,  
rich public  
a Jesuit so-  
n. I found  
used jesuits  
ledger, and  
these public  
her wasted,  
go it blind"  
or, else al-  
unpaid in  
n Assembly  
gnors with  
—an U. C.  
C. majority  
In Comr.  
31st Jan

## 75] LOWER CANADA FIRE LOANS.

1856, I find that there are defaulting tenants in Batis-  
can owing 5,191; defaulters at St. Gabriel, Quebec,  
&c. owing 16,896; defaulters at Laprairie 4,800;  
other defaulters 3,772; total 30,653; while Upper  
Canadians are making landlords of other French ten-  
ants, the L. C. crown tenants don't even pay their  
penny per acre! 4,681 were collected in 1855, off  
which 1,079 are clipped for trouble of collecting and  
disbursements, and on hundreds of thousands of dol-  
lars of "the fund" Canada is paying interest to the  
Jesuits! Not one Lower Canada member will allow  
the slightest change to be made in this vile scheme.

### Montreal Fire Loan.

A fire burnt down part of Montreal in 1852. The  
corporation had been very careless, or the fire might  
have been put down with ease at its commencement.  
The next move was to try to borrow on the endorse-  
ment of Canada: that succeeded in 1853—\$800,000  
were by statute allowed to be borrowed, and I think  
that \$400,000 of that sum were got from the usurious  
London association who borrow there at 3 and lend  
here at 8 per cent. In this case they may have lent  
at six. The original proposition held each property  
for the special loan, but Monsieur Lafontaine, Mon-  
sieur Morin, and Mr. Hincks dissolved that part of the  
scheme. Hincks's bill provided that if enough of suf-  
ferers by the fire did not come forward, non-sufferers  
might take the residue. Why should Canada as a  
province endorse for Montreal in case of fire any more  
than for Toronto? Ten to one but our lazy neighbors  
below will throw interest and principal on the shoul-  
ders of Upper Canadians, before long. How the loan  
stands now, or how far Canada remains bound, I say  
not, for our managers are a band of cunning jugglers,  
and no trick they may play Canada ought to astonish  
any one. The province endorsed \$800,000.

### Quebec Fire Fraud—Another \$500,000.

There have been very heavy fires at Toronto, King-  
ston, Hamilton, London, Guelph, and other towns of  
Upper Canada, but the sufferers, never received aid  
from the treasury of United Canada. When, how-  
ever, a fire consumed part of a suburb in Quebec  
money was borrowed, say £84,000 at 6 per cent. on  
the credit of Canada, and let to such property-owners  
as the authorities chose to favor. They were to pay  
4 per cent interest, and gradually redeem the prin-  
cipal; but government, influenced by covetous French  
members, wink at the non-payment of principal and  
interest; they swear to observe the law and wilfully  
break it; and in 1854, FIVE THOUSAND AND  
FIFTY POUNDS were paid out of the Common fund  
for interest, the Frenchmen only advancing £168.

Why should Upper Canada have paid twenty-  
thousand dollars a year as interest, during a number  
of years, and be liable for the principal, of money  
long since lent to a few opulent landowners in Que-  
bec, who have neither the honesty to replace in the  
treasury, the loans nor the usury? It is one of the  
blessings of French connection.

In the case of fire at Quebec, the begging box went  
through Britain and the Northern States; very large  
sums were received. Upper Canada helped, and is  
now paying three-fourths of \$20,000 a year of interest  
which an honest governor would have kept his oath  
by securing, but while every Assembly-man must  
have \$2500 of landed estate, a governor is foisted on  
us not interested, not a resident, ignorant of our  
country, not a landowner to the value of five farth-  
ings.

The country has already paid nine times \$20,000, or  
\$180,000 for the Frenchmen, who will not let us re-  
gulate even our children's school affairs. If they  
want to convert us, let them pay back these \$180,-  
000, and prepare to meet the principal. Why should

## CANALS AND RAILWAYS. [76

the Province turn land pawn broker? Soon after  
the property-holders had clutched the debentures,  
some of the shabbiest of them prayed to be forgiven  
principal and interest, on account of losses sustained  
in turning Canada bonds into cash! Jean Baptiste is  
a hard bargain, very.

### Expenditure on Public Works in Lower Canada, which yield (some) Revenue.

Monsieur Lemieux, in his report of 1856, thus  
recapitulates the cost of the public works, built  
three-fourths with Upper Canada cash—one-  
fourth with Lower Canada money:

Beauharnois Canal.....	£365,331
Lachine Canal.....	481,736
Junction Canal.....	38,780
Chats Canal, (Ottawa).....	31,153
Chambly Canal.....	16,863
St. Ours' Canal or Lock.....	38,219
St. Ann's Canal.....	23,660
Bytown Bridge, (Ottawa).....	16,612
River St. Maurice.....	48,699
Ottawa River.....	117,648

£1,178,741

or \$4,714,964; from which, taking the whole  
together, the NET income, as managed, after pay-  
ing all charges, is NOT TWO PENCE a year!  
\$3,513,723 of the money or credit of Upper  
Canada, is invested in the concerns. Are we  
likely to get a cent back? Would any English  
or other creditor accept Lower Canada as security?  
What has she to export? What are her manufac-  
tures, except sharp, selfish, sordid politicians?  
The cost of repairs and management of the above  
works in 1855 was, for the Lachine Canal,  
£8,078 (only nine miles long); Beauharnois  
Canal, £4,628; Ottawa, £3,234; even the St.  
Maurice costs £2,072, besides other £10,436 laid  
out (on favorites I suppose down there). The  
expenditure (besides repairs) on above Lower  
Canada works, in 1855, was £83,514. No won-  
der our farms are heavily mortgaged in London!

Another pill at the purse. Our French  
masters have authorized Larue, Sirois and Bur-  
roughs to arbitrate £31,185 12s. 6d. into the  
pockets of a few individuals who set up an out-  
cry that the Beauharnois Canal had injured them;  
also £1,754 to Larue & Co. for their trouble!

In 1855, there were not expended, of pub-  
lic money, in Haldimand, or Norfolk, or  
Elgin one penny. Trent and Newcastle im-  
provements, expenditure 1855, £12,114; Bur-  
lington Canal, expenditure 1855, £7,422; Port  
Stanley Harbour, expenditure 1855, £3,944  
(Cotton's contract I suppose).

Monsieur Lemieux reports 28 light houses  
and light-house keepers in Canada; and that  
their salaries and supplies were £7,220 in 1854,  
and £6,381 in 1855. Who checks? As usual  
"nobody."

Expended on Public works (awards in-  
cluded) 1854 and '55, (over and above railway  
votes,) £839,906; (but how spent?)

EXPENSE OF GENERAL ELECTION, 1854.—Upper  
Canada £4,070; Lower Canada £5,887—total £9,-  
557, of which L. C. contributes £2,389, and U. C.  
£7,168. Jean Baptiste's a hard bargain—very.