

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 tenants, the L. C. crown tenants dont 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 dollars 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 endorsement 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, Monsieur Morin, and Mr. Hincks dissolved that part of the scheme. Hincks's bill provided that if enough of sufferers 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 shoulders of Upper Canadians, before long. How the loan stands now, or how fir 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, Kingston, Hamilton, London, Guelph, and other towns of Upper Canada, but the sufferers, never received aid from the treasury of United Canada. When, however, 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 principal; but government, influenced by covetous French members, wink at the non-payment of principal and interest; they await 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 Quebec, 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 farthings.

The country has already paid nine times \$20,000, or \$180,000 for the Frenchmen, who will not let us regulate even our children's school affairs. If they want to convert us, let them pay back these \$190,000, and prepare to meet the principal. Why should

the Province turn land pawn broker? Soon after the property-holders had eluded 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 paying all charges, is NOT TWO PENNY a year! \$3,543,723 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 manufactures, 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 wonder our farms are heavily mortgaged in London!

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

In 1855, there were not expended, of public money, in Haldimand, or Norfolk, or Elgin one penny. Trent and Newcastle improvements, expenditure 1855, £12,114; Burlington 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 £6,384 in 1855. Who checks? As usual "nobody."

Expended on Public works (awards included) 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 £9,957, of which L. C. contributes £2,389, and U. C. £7,168. Jean Baptiste's a hard bargain—very.

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

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

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

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

TRICK.

uits who im-
and Austria,
rich public
a Jesuit son-
n. I found
used jesuits
ledger, and
hese public
her wasted,
go it blind"
, or else al-
n-paid in
n Assembly
nors with
—an U. C.
C. majority
In Comr.
31st Jan