

This concern was originated, and very naturally, on the petition of the notorious ex-mayor Bowes, &c.—An attempt was made to press it on illegally, but frustrated; next Hincks moved to suspend rule requiring notice of consideration; and finally the House, 7 to 49 voted down Young's excellent motion [see p. 335 of Journals] to amend the bill so "that it shall bear on its face the character of the work to be executed upon the road, and the terms and conditions upon which it shall be executed."

I voted nay because I had resolved to go against the whole measure, but how could Rolph! White! Burnham, Hincks! Christie! Clapham, Crawford, Drummond, Hartman! Morin! Murney, Patrick! Richards! Seymour, Terrill, Shaw, Smith of Durham, Street! Willson, Turcotte, and the TWO Wrights do so? They were for the measure. None of them are to be found among the nays at the third reading [page 373.] The company, if it is not, like the Huron and Ontario, a sham one, will suffer deeply.

**£100,000 MISSING.**

In 1843 or 1844, the British government sent a letter to the Parliament of Canada, that after paying the expense of the establishment, as annually shown by Postmaster Stayner's bills, the balance would be put back into the province chest. When the colony got the control of the post office there was a balance due the colony of £100,000, over and above Stayner's expenditures. I asked an account of it, and copy of any correspondence about it, but Hincks, Lafontaine, Cauchon, & Co. voted down all enquiry. Last session, with Rolph, &c. in office, I renewed my motion—simply for information where our money was—and the government—Rolph, Hincks, Morin, Ross, Morris (sly and sleek), Richards, &c. refused.—[Jour. p. 423.]

**ELECT ALL THE COUNCIL!**

The government scheme of last session was an elective council or senate, to be partly nominated by the Governor—partly elected—a portion of the present old and worn out councillors to remain—another section to be chosen from men holding £1000 in real estate—the elective system to be adopted only gradually. For the above, AND AGAINST A PROPOSAL TO ELECT ALL AT ONCE, voted (successfully)

Hincks!	Rolph!	Gamble,
Prince,	Cameron,	G. Wright,
Hartman,	Richards,	A. Wright,
Patrick,	White,	Ferguson, &c.

**FOUR DOLLARS A DAY TO 30 LEGISLATIVE COUNCILLORS!**

June 13, 1853—the day before the prorogation—\$20,000 was moved to the Legislative Council to meet casual expenses, besides double pay to a whole host of useless officers, a heavy drag on the country. Yeas, Brown, Rolph, Robinson, Christie, Cameron, Merritt, Sherwood, Ferguson, Burnham, Willson, &c. Carried.

The next move was to pay each councillor, from the Speaker, who gets the \$3200 a year, down to the banker, who represents his own breeches pocket, Four dollars a day during session, also mileage money—to pay them thus for thwarting any good we may do—and to meet this only, \$18,000 were asked, including double pay to placemen having seats there.

For four dollars a day to each councillor, whether otherwise overpaid or not, voted [See Jour. p. 1097]—

Rolph,	Amos Wright,	Christie,
Prince,	Hincks,	Cameron,
Cartier,	Drummond,	Ferguson,
Merritt,	Egan,	Richards,
Smith, Jm.,	Rose,	Chabot, &c.

Invisible at voting time, Gamble, Hartman, G.

Wright, &c. A close vote of 27 to 26. The Council costs the country \$100,000 a year.

**THE KILLALY BRIBE.**

Killaly has been paid the regular salary (\$2,500 or \$3,500) attached to his office of assistant-commissioner, ever since he held it; but Hincks wanted him to play a part on the London boards, during the Grand Trunk recharter; and some say that at first Killaly hesitated. Be this as it may, a mock account for pretended labor done was passed in Council, nodded to by Lord Elgin, and offered to the Assembly as £719 17s. 3d. to Killaly "for engineering services on the Welland Canal," Feb. 1851 to Dec. 1852, at \$1000 a year.

When it came to the vote, the artful old dodger, Rolph, who had voted a few minutes before, and who voted again a few minutes thereafter, slipped off into the adjoining rooms. If cringing servility, an abandonment of principle, for which the country was convulsed, puffs about "princely stamina," and playing the decoy to independent editors and members whom he hopes to bring "under stipulations," deserve reward from a bad system, Rolph should be provided for.

The votes for the Killaly bribe (Jour. 1098 and '99) were

Hincks!	Richards!	Prince,
Cameron!	Ferguson!	Smith, Durham,
Morin,	Christie!	Willson,
Lyon,	Merritt!	McLaelin, &c.

Even Street and Robinson, bad as they are, could not swallow this vote; but poor Kill got his bone and is off to London to play his part in puffing for his employers.

**HINCKS'S PECULATIONS. THE £10,000.**

One thing I liked exceedingly ill in the conduct of Rolph, Christie, White, Hartman, the Wrights, Smith of Durham, Cameron, Hincks, and indeed the whole House. It was this:

I had early in the session, proposed in committee some enquiry into expenditures and been met by Hincks with, "if you have any specific charges to make against any member of the government, a committee will at once be allowed to enquire into them."

It was privately known, I dare say, to three fourths of the Assembly that Hincks had used his position to pillage those who were short of cash, and bend legislation to his private ends, especially in the case of the £10,000 so disgracefully shared by him and Bowes, aided by McCord, the officious Chamberlain here, toward the close of that job.

Sherwood had urged me on. None, however, dared move in the matter. I plainly charged Hincks with deception in the £100,000 city bills—stated the facts, and that he and Bowes had the £10,000—that Bidout of the U. C. Bank, was in Quebec, and could be summoned—that the facts could and ought to be promptly got at—that it concerned the House to see that no knavery was practised,—and I asked government to consent to a committee—but Morin said No, and when I placed my motion in the Speaker's hands not a member would second it!

Another night I tried enquiry—found a second in Hartman—but before it came to the vote he withdrew his motion, lest Mr. Hincks might be offended by seeing the votes on the Journal. No fear of the present House unmasking knavery—if the knaves have anything to bestow! Had I got a committee we could have had all the facts promptly, and the remedy in chancery would have been bettered by it—but among the £2 not one man wanted to appear desirous to look carefully into Hincks's peccadilloes. He had finance, banks, assembly, &c. at his finger ends. More's the pity!