

tice the amendment of the Hon. Mr. Robinson, proposing to exclude from compensation "ANY PERSON WHO WAS IN ANY MANNER IMPLICATED IN THE SAID REBELLION, OR WHO REFUSED, WHEN CALLED UPON, TO AID IN SUPPRESSING IT;" and that of Mr. Wilson, who moved to insert the following words—"NOR ANY PERSON WHO AIDED, ASSISTED OR ABETTED THE SAID REBELLION, SHALL BE ENTITLED TO ANY INDEMNITY." Both of these proposed amendments were REJECTED by a "large majority of Representatives," who thus openly refused to exclude from indemnification those who had "aided, assisted, or abetted the Rebellion;"* and yet, Your Lordship has been induced by your Advisers to believe—and to promulgate that belief—that this "large majority of Representatives" did not intend "to countenance Rebellion, or to compensate the losses of persons guilty of the heinous crime of treason."

I have hitherto confined myself, as Your Lordship will observe, to the proceedings and debates in the Legislative Assembly; and with regard to the progress of the Bill through the Legislative Council, my remarks shall be very brief. The debates in that House were not unattended with points of interest, as regards the question in the solution of which I am now engaged, but I shall only offer to Your Lordship's consideration the statements of one of the Honorable Members of the House,—the Hon. Robert Jones. You have doubtless not forgotten, my Lord, that this was one of the twelve gentlemen elevated to the Upper House, by the advice of your present Ministry, in the course of less than six months, thus raising the number of members of the House from 33 to 45. Mr. Jones, as might have been supposed from this appointment, is in general a supporter of the Ministerial policy, as well as a personal and intimate friend of several of your Ministry; but on the momentous question of the Rebellion Losses Bill, he could not bend

his conscience to vote for what he considered an "encouragement of acts of insubordination." His manly and energetic speech in the Council, on the 14th March, is worthy of Your Lordship's attentive perusal, and I quote from it at some length, from a newspaper to which I must again have recourse, as the only notice taken in the *Montreal Pilot* is the following sentence, in its issue of the 16th: "The Hon. Mr. Jones, one of the new members, spoke against the Bill:"—

"It appeared to him that, *by the bill, all who were not excluded by the proviso, were clearly entitled to their claims, and justly too, under its provisions. If there had been no proviso, they might have believed the professions of the Ministry; but, since there had been a provision made to the bill, it should have gone a little further. As it stood at present, it would admit the claims of persons just as guilty as those who were excluded, and if the simple terms 'or all who were guilty of an overt act of rebellion,' had been added to the provision, he would have voted for it. And why did they not do this?—it would have disarmed the opposition conclusively. But he had reason to know that no class of persons would be excluded who were guilty of overt acts of rebellion; and he knew that persons who had menaced his own life, who had attempted to destroy his property, and had harassed and distressed his family, were claimants, and he could not support their being paid. He could not give the bill his support, but, on the contrary, he felt himself bound to oppose it, because he felt it would include a class of persons some of whom he mentioned to one of the Ministry; THAT MEMBER OF THE GOVERNMENT DID NOT DENY THAT THEY WERE GUILTY OF OPEN ACTS OF REBELLION.* He (Mr. J.) said therefore that if they professed to treat those who upheld the constitution of their country and those who did their best to subvert the laws alike, they removed the landmarks of morality, they encouraged acts of insubordination. He was happy to hear, however, from those who supported the measure, that they repudiated the rebellion of 1837-38; he was happy to hear that they did not consider that the hand of oppression weighed heavy enough upon them to justify resistance to the laws of their country; for assuredly there were no circumstances at the time of the rebellion to justify resistance to the laws of the land; things had not arrived at that point at which resistance became justifiable, and if there was anything to justify a rebellion in 1837, there was assuredly nothing in 1838, when the Imperial Government had sent out a High Commissioner to enquire into their grievances, and when the Commissioner had promised them redress. He considered that there was no pretext, no ground whatever, for getting up a rebellion in 1838, and he considered that the rebellion which broke out then was nothing but a foul conspiracy to destroy the lives and property of the loyal people of the country. He had suffered from that conspiracy, and he could not support a measure to pay those persons who attempted to destroy his property and meditate his

*See Postscript, Page 18.

life. By would be considered sary to pr try."—[M

On a May—M the Min

"He ha port the he was st he was di far at lea policy mi try. Wh before th Indemniti suming, a ing, that sons as v clauses, v during th to inform of it, he possible sation he e satisfy h measure. the prt and '38, provision proviso raised hi the coun thing to to indem alone wh made in suffered acts, wa tinctly r hon. Spc hon. me Morris), to hear because thing he any othe had such men who would h sion in t of the neither ration a Morris, to adve hon. Spc bill allu took pla tinguish interview had sta tion, exp interview tion on