

The compensation thus to be awarded to the seignior on a change of tenure is not only rendered very precarious and uncertain, but has no direct relation to the actual and real value of the property, is infinitely less than what was recommended as a just and fair arrangement by the Canada commissioners in their general report in 1836, and is founded on principles entirely contrary to the evidence of the attorney general Ogden and solicitor general O'Sullivan, as annexed thereto, and to the more equitable manner of which the real value of such seigniorial property was established in France, when the *régime féodal* was done away with at the commencement of the Revolution in 1789-90. By the enactments of the bills as now proposed in Canada :

1st. The annual rents are to be estimated by the present rental which is taken to represent the interest of capital at 6 per cent, and thus an annual and increasing rent of £12 is taken to represent £200, which is redeemable at the option of the tenant, but not of the seignior.

In France, although the *régime féodal* was abolished in revolutionary times, the rents were valued at 20 and 25 years purchase, and thus a rent £12 per annum would represent £300 capital payable the seignior, a much more equitable arrangement than that proposed at the present moment in Canada.

2nd. The *lods et ventes*, or fine of one twelfth of the real value, payable to the seignior on each mutation by sale, is to be estimated by taking the receipts of fourteen years, and after deducting the receipts of the two highest and two lowest years, then assuming the average of the remaining ten years as the value of the income of the seignior, and to represent the interest of capital at 6 per cent, redeemable at the option of the censitaire or tenant, but not of the seignior, and distributed in proportion to the lands of the whole seignior. This tortuous and confused mode of estimating and valuing a revenue derived from so extremely fluctuating and increasing a source as a fine on each mutation by sale, is palpably unjust and a mere lottery, depending entirely on the accidental circumstance of whether large sums have been paid in two, or the same amount has been paid in three or more years, and a seignior having a seignior or seigniorial lands of ten times the value, and having actually received ten times the amount of income for fourteen years, may nevertheless actually receive less compensation under these bills than a seignior having a seignior of only one tenth of the value, but where the payments of *lods et ventes* have happened to be made differently.

The rents of lands are excessively low, and great source of seigniorial revenue is the *lods et ventes*, or fine due to the seignior when property is sold, and thus from its nature the receipts from *lods et ventes* are liable to very great fluctuation, but of vastly increasing value, and the estimation and valuation to take place under the enactments of these bills, has in fact no relation to the actual and real value of the seignior's property, and the amount so estimated and again revalued, by being converted into capital at 6 per cent interest, is not only quite inadequate, but is arbitrary and unjust, as not being founded on the real and actual value of the rights and property the seignior is required to surrender and give up for the public good, and is in direct contradiction to the opinions of the attorney general Ogden and solicitor general O'Sullivan, as given in their evidence to the Canada commissioners of 1836.

A seignior, who for the last fourteen years has received of *lods et ventes*, or fines on sales within his seignior, an amount of £1,600 in four payments, would have an