

the State of Michigan, or Illinois, or Indiana has advantages superior to us. The improvements alluded to, are carried on by each State independently on *its own credit*, and the money is obtained in England, where our debentures cannot be sold.—The unkind allusions made by Mr. Hagerman are but a poor return for Lord Durham's generous efforts to promote our public improvements. Equally unkind is the allusion to the recommendation of New York as a port of entry. It is well known that the Hon. W. Allan, and the Hon. R. Sullivan, and we believe Mr. Hagerman himself, joined nearly all the principal merchants of this city in recommending this project. It was brought under Lord Durham's notice and he is now censured for recommending, what all parties, Tories as well as Reformers concurred in demanding. Mr. Hagerman assumes that the effect of this arrangement would be to prevent our public works being supported. Such would not be the case. The St. Lawrence would still be the outlet for all heavy goods, and we should only obtain those commodities via New York, suited for the Spring trade, and which would arrive six weeks sooner by this route. The matter is only mentioned incidentally by Lord Durham, no argument in favour of his measures is founded on it, and he *had reason to suppose* that in bringing it under the consideration of her Majesty's Government, he was complying with the wishes of the very party who now basely endeavor to found on it an accusation against him. How Mr. Hagerman could deliberately make the assertion that the project would not "*receive countenance from any quarter*" after an expression from the Board of Trade of Toronto, from a public meeting of the inhabitants at which were two, if not more, of the present Executive Council, and which expression has never been publicly recalled, we are at a loss to imagine.

Lord Durham's allusion to the "carelessness and profusion" which marked the expenditure on the public works, has given great offence to Mr. Hagerman and his friends, and has been indignantly repelled as a "most unmerited and ungenerous insinuation." We cannot be surprised at this. One of the very cases alluded to by Lord Durham was, doubtless, that of Mr. W. B. Robinson, one of Mr. Hagerman's select committee on the Report. This gentleman was a Commissioner for expending a large sum of money, say £7,500, on the Welland Canal. His services were *not gratuitous*, as Mr. Hagerman insinuates. No proper account of the money was ever rendered. The vouchers were scandalous, in fact entirely inadmissible. *Crosses* without witnesses were produced as receipts for money. In one case a receipt of a man named Shore (a cross without a witness) was altered from £8 10s. to £18 10s. although the order for the money was for £8 10s. and the entry in the Secretary's book £8 10s. Credit was taken on this voucher, altered as it was, for £18 10s. and the matter *still remains unexplained*. The report of a select committee of the House of Assembly, signed by six members of the present House, charges Mr. Robinson with being *deficient about £300 in his ac-*