

the debates alluded to, and have searched in vain for any questions put to the Ministry relative to their intention of paying rebels, with the exception of those I have quoted in page 7 of the foregoing letter, or for any denial of the intention imputed to them. I leave Your Lordship to determine whether the uniform statement at the close of these questions, "No Reply," can be considered as an answer.

III. THE VOTE ON MR. WILSON'S AMENDMENT. [See page 10.]

In humble imitation of the example set by Your Lordship, in the Reply to the Brantford Address, and in your Despatch of the 5th May, I will venture to present an analysis of the vote taken on the amendment of Mr. Wilson, to exclude Rebels, which was negatived by 43 against 28. This latter number, as will be seen on reference to the Appendix, was entirely composed of English; while of those who voted against the amendment, 8 are members of the Ministry, 21 are of French and 14 of British origin; of which last, four—Messrs. Armstrong, DeWitt, Nelson, and W. H. Scott—have been long thoroughly identified with the French party. Thus of the 38 *independent British* members who voted on this question, 28 were *in favor of*, and only 10 *against*, the amendment proposed by Mr. Wilson.

Taking it in another point of view, the votes may be thus stated:

Upper Canada,	Yeas, 23	Nays, 13
Lower Canada,	" 5	" 30
	—	—
	28	43

giving a majority of 25 from *Lower Canada*, it is true, in favor of admitting rebels to compensation, but a *majority of 10, from Upper Canada*, against their admission. Thus Lower Canada taxes Upper Canada to pay Lower Canadian Rebels!

IV. MR. PAPINEAU. [See page 14.]

The following paragraph, my Lord, is quoted from the *Illustrated London News* of the 19th May:

"When in office, they (the Canadian Loyalists) introduced a measure into the Legislature for compensating the parties who had suffered losses in the rebellion of 1838. Among the parties who came in for compensation under this very measure was no less a personage than Mr. Speaker Papineau, the very head and front of the insurrection."

This, my Lord, is but the repetition, in a somewhat stronger form than might have been ventured on here, of a charge which has often been made against the previous Conservative Administration, and has been as often refuted. As it is very possible, however, that the charge may have been carefully presented to Your Lordship's notice, and the refutation of it just as carefully withheld, it is but fair that Your Lordship should know to whom Canada is indebted for the privilege of again admitting within its borders Mr. Louis Joseph Papineau. My authority on the subject is Mr. LaFontaine, who, in the debate on the Address, when blamed by Mr. Papineau for accepting office under the British Government, thus replied:

"Assuming that he (Mr. LaFontaine) had in so doing committed an error, to whom had the benefit of that error accrued? Was it not the honourable member himself who had reaped the benefit of it? Without such an error he (Mr. Papineau) *would not to-day be standing within the walls of that House*, to pour forth as he did a torrent of invective against his old political friends; *he would still have dwelt in a land of exile*."—[*Montreal Pilot*, 7th Feb., 1849.]

And again, in a subsequent portion of the same speech Mr. LaFontaine reiterated his claims to Mr. Papineau's gratitude.

"If, in 1842, they had adopted the system of opposition *a l'outrance*, so favored by the honorable member, would they have been in a position to solicit, to urge as they had done, the return of their exiled countrymen to their homes and their families? Had they not formed part of the administration of 1842, would they have had it in their power to open for the honorable member (Mr. Papineau), *in particular*, the avenues to his native land, *by obtaining the requisite permission for his return to the country*?—a permission for the obtaining of which, he (Mr. LaFontaine) had not hesitated, before conquering the repeated refusals of Sir Charles Metcalfe, *to tender his resignation of the high and lucrative offices he then held*?"—[*Montreal Pilot*, 7th Feb., 1849.]

And yet, My Lord, the assertion is coolly made that the Conservative Ministry, by recalling Mr. Papineau, had led the way to the measures of the present Administration.

The s
paper ab
compens
for "his
totally w
out of th
to Mr. L
sury, for
the Hou
rants ha
officers,
received
exile fro
Canada,
Fontaine
Conserv
Parliame
for paym
"unfort
which, i
had been
the Prov
of whie
was now
perial C
represent
—Mr.
I rep
not brow
vative A

REE

An Act
parti
was a
years

WHEREA
humble
Legislati
presenc
philus B