

who do not bear thoroughly French names. Even in this small number of 170 are included not a few claimants, such as Dr. Wolfred Nelson, and Mr. W. H. Scott of Two Mountains, who were active participators in the Rebellion—some who claim as creditors of Dr. Nelson and others of the Rebels of 1837–38—and upwards of 20 whose claims, amounting to £4,300, had already been recognised by the previous Commission.

The Report in question exhibits some curious facts, which are now of an importance that could not be attached to them at the time of its presentation, when any proposal for the indiscriminate payment of the claims therein contained could not for a moment have been anticipated. The claims in all amount to £241,965 10s. 5d., of which the sum of £25,903 15s. 7d., is claimed by 60 persons who had been *convicted of high treason*, and £16,053 11s. 4d., by parties who had been transported to Bermuda. Both of these classes of claimants are of course excluded by Mr. Boulton's amendment, from direct indemnification, and I therefore deduct them, although, as I have already shewn, the claims of their "*bonâ fide* creditors, assigns or *ayant-droit*," could not be refused under the Act; besides these, claims to the amount of £10,292 4s. 1d., which had already been allowed by the Commissioners first appointed, and which therefore required no new legislation, must be deducted. The remaining £190,000, include claims which had been preferred before the previous Commission, but *not recognised by them*, to the amount of £59,403 16s. 10d.; claims to be compensated for imprisonment as rebels, exile from the country, or "absence from the Province to avoid arrest," (it being noted in *only one* case, that the prisoner had been acquitted,) £9,595 9s. 1d., besides money alleged to have been paid as bribes to avoid imprisonment; for interest on claims, £5,819 9s. 3d.; for *loss of expected profit*, £5,331 4s. 1d.; for guns and other weapons seized by Government, £694 19s.

10d.; claims as unpaid creditors of rebels, £4,174 0s. 8d., besides claims on Dr. Nelson's estate alone, amounting to £10,730 6s. 10d.

There is also a claim for £5,349 10s. 11d., presented by Mr. W. H. Scott, for whose apprehension a reward of £500 was paid in 1837. This gentleman is now M. P. P. for the County of Two Mountains, and Your Lordship will observe that his vote, in that capacity, is recorded on the Ministerial side in every division on Mr. LaFontaine's resolutions—a vote invalidated, I should have thought, by his pecuniary interest in the question. The last claims I shall mention are those for confiscated property purchased by the wives or other relatives of the former proprietors, amounting, in two cases alone, to £795 6s. 8d. If Your Lordship should consider these as fitting cases for compensation, I would respectfully suggest that, overcoming your unwillingness to consider this as in any respect an Imperial question, Your Lordship, should request the Home Government to indemnify these losses out of *the Imperial Treasury, into which the money received for the property so confiscated was paid*.

I leave these claims for your consideration, my Lord, with the sole remark, that there is not a single word in the Rebellion Losses Bill to exclude the payment of any one of them, even were Your Lordship's Ministry so far to contravene the terms of the Act as to instruct the Commissioners to perpetrate, (in the words of the Hon. Robert Baldwin,) such "*an outrage on the man seeking compensation as to inquire what part he took at the time of the troubles!*"

II. COLONEL PRINCE'S QUESTIONS. [See page 8.]

Mr. LaFontaine, as Your Lordship will observe, refused to answer the plain and simple questions proposed to him by Colonel Prince, on the ground that they had been asked and answered over and over again during the debate. Since the first publication of this letter, I have carefully examined