

at he considered
of insubordina-
getic speech in
arch, is worthy
perusal, and I
e, from a news-
have recourse,
the *Montreal Pi-*
e, in its issue of
ones, one of the
the Bill :”—

Bill, all who were
arly entitled to their
visions. If there
e believed the pro-
there had been a
d have gone a lit-
e, it would admit the
those who were ex-
or all who were
had been added
oted for it. And
uld have disarmed
t he had reason to
t be excluded who
; and he knew that
a life, who had at-
and had harassed
nants, and he could
could not give the
try, he felt himself
t it would include a
mentioned to one of
OF THE GOV-
Y THAT THEY
TS OF REBEL-
re that if they pro-
the constitution of
their best to subvert
landmarks of mor-
subordination. He
those who support-
iated the rebellion
r that they did not
sion weighed heavy
stance to the laws
there were no cir-
ellion to justify re-
things had not ar-
ance became justi-
to justify a rebel-
y nothing in 1838,
ad sent out a High
eir grievances, and
aised them redress.
pretext, no ground
on in 1838, and he
ch broke out then
acy to destroy the
ople of the country.
iracy, and he could
se persons who at-
y and meditate his

life. By supporting such a measure, he thought he would be acting quite inconsistently with what he considered his duty, and what he considered necessary to preserve his peace and property in the country.”—[*Montreal Gazette*, 19th March, 1849.]

On a subsequent occasion—the 14th of May—Mr. Jones reiterated his belief that the Ministry did intend to pay Rebels:—

“He had come into this House predisposed to support the Administration, professing then to be, as he was still, a liberal in his opinions. He repeated he was disposed to support the Administration, so far at least as he should consider their measures and policy might tend to promote the good of the country. When the measure to which the question now before the House led him—he meant the Rebellion Indemnity Bill—was introduced into Parliament, assuming, as he was constrained to do from its wording, that it embraced in its provisions all such persons as were not expressly excluded by one of its clauses, without reference to the part they had taken during the rebellions of 1837 and ‘38; but desiring to inform himself as to the correctness of his views of it, he sought light upon the subject from every possible source, and he must say that all the information he could gather in regard to it concurred to satisfy him that he had taken a correct view of the measure. He was convinced that all, *irrespective of the part they had taken during the rebellion of 1837 and ‘38, would be entitled to be indemnified under the provisions of the bill, who were not excluded by the proviso contained in it, that is to say, he who had raised his arm to subvert the Queen’s authority in the country, as well as he who had done the same thing to support it, would indiscriminately be entitled to indemnity by the bill, with the exception of those alone who were particularly excluded by the provision made in the bill itself; consequently, he who had suffered loss through his rebellion and his own wicked acts, would be entitled to be paid such loss. He distinctly recollected the remarks which fell from the hon. Speaker on a recent occasion, adverted to by the hon. member who spoke before the last (Mr. James Morris), and he must confess that he was surprised to hear these remarks at the time they were made, because they were so much at variance with everything he had before heard from that hon. member or any other member of the administration. Assuredly, had such views been entertained by those hon. gentlemen when the bill was introduced into Parliament, they would have expressed them when it was under discussion in that house. There were three Hon. members of the administration present on that occasion, neither of whom ventured to make any such declaration at that time. As the hon’ble member (Mr. J. Morris) to whom he had alluded, had thought proper to advert to a statement made to him personally by the hon. Speaker, which he said induced him to support the bill alluded to, he (Mr. Jones) would advert to what took place between himself and another hon. and distinguished member of the Government, at a private interview, in contradiction to what the hon. member had stated as the views entertained by the administration, expressed to him by the hon. Speaker. At the interview he referred to, after considerable conversation on the subject of the Indemnity Bill had taken*

place, and considerable difference of opinion had arisen between them in respect to it, IN ORDER THAT HE MIGHT NOT MISTAKE THE VIEWS OF THE HON. MEMBER OF THE GOVERNMENT, HE (Mr. Jones) HAD NAMED THREE OR MORE PERSONS WHOM HE AND THAT DISTINGUISHED MEMBER OF THE GOVERNMENT BOTH KNEW TO HAVE BEEN ENGAGED IN OVERT ACTS OF TREASON AND REBELLION; THAT THEY WERE PERSONS WHO HAD TAKEN UP ARMS TO SUBVERT THE GOVERNMENT; HE ASKED HIM IF THOSE INDIVIDUALS WOULD BE ENTITLED TO INDEMNITY UNDER THE BILL? THAT HON. MEMBER OF THE GOVERNMENT WAS TOO HONEST AND TOO HONORABLE A MAN TO ATTEMPT TO DECEIVE HIM; HE THEREFORE ANSWERED HIM CANDIDLY AND FRANKLY, THAT THEY COULD MAKE NO DISTINCTION, AND CONSEQUENTLY THOSE PERSONS COULD NOT BE EXCLUDED FROM BEING INDEMNIFIED FOR THEIR LOSSES, IF THEY HAD SUSTAINED ANY. He should not have adverted to this circumstance had he not deemed it necessary to do so, to meet the assertion openly made by the hon. Speaker from his place in that house, and the statement of the hon. member who had based his opinions upon the information he had personally received from the same hon. individual.” [*Montreal Pilot Supplement*, 19th May, 1849.]

No contradiction has ever been attempted of this frank and open statement, even by that member of Your Lordship’s Administration (Mr. LaFontaine) who is generally believed to be therein alluded to. The veracity of Mr. Jones is above suspicion, and the proof here afforded that the framer of this unfortunate Bill contemplated the “indemnification of persons guilty of the heinous crime of treason,” is unanswerable and overwhelming.

I trust that I have now established, to Your Lordship’s satisfaction, the position I set out to maintain,—that the intention of your present Administration, in the introduction of the Rebellion Losses Bill, was to indemnify parties engaged in the Rebellion of 1837 and 1838. Should such be the case, I presume it will be apparent to Your Lordship that the meaning of the passage I have italicised towards the close of the Reply to the Hastings Address, undergoes a very important modification. Under the belief, which Your Lordship’s advisers had succeeded in impressing on your mind, that the