

No. 17.

Despatch from
Lord Aylmer to
Mr. Sec. Stanley,
3 July 1834.

Enclosure 10.

Enclosure 10; in No. 17.

EXTRACT of a REPORT made by a Committee of the whole Council, dated 4 November 1830, and approved by his Excellency the Governor-in-Chief in Council, 7 December 1830, on the petition of *W. B. Felton, Esq.*, praying that, as late Purser in the Royal Navy, he may obtain a Grant of the Clergy Reserves, Lots No. 12, in the ninth range, No. 10, in the tenth range, and No. 11, in the seventh range of the Township of Ascot, in exchange for Lands of equal value formerly granted to him in the Township of Ham.

THE committee having perused the letter of the Lord Bishop of Quebec, of the 30th May last, wherein his Lordship expresses the acquiescence of the clergy corporation in the proposed arrangement of an exchange of the Clergy Reserves, being Lots No. 12 in the ninth range, and No. 10 in the tenth range of the township of Ascot, for lands of equal value, they humbly recommend that the petitioner obtain a grant of these lots, and that two lots in the township of Ham be laid out as an equivalent for the clergy as to No. 7 in the eleventh range of the township of Ascot, and No. 19 in the second range of Hatley; inasmuch as it appears that these lots are still undisposed of, the committee humbly advise that the same be granted to the petitioner.

(Certified.)

George H. Ryland.

— No. 18. —

COPY of a DESPATCH from Mr. Secretary *Spring Rice* to Lord *Aylmer*.

(Confidential.)

My Lord,

Downing-street, 29th October 1834.

No. 18.
Despatch from
Mr. Sec. S. Rice
to Lord Aylmer,
29 October 1834.

I HAVE had the honour to receive your Lordship's despatch, No. 58, of the 3d July last, accompanied by the explanation, which my predecessor directed you to require, from Mr. Felton, respecting certain grants of Crown lands to himself and his children, that had been found considerably to exceed the amount of any grants sanctioned by His Majesty's Government. The facts of the case, as they appear from the various documents appended to your Lordship's communication, may be stated as follows:

In the year 1826, Mr. Felton, being already in possession of grants of land to the extent of more than 10,000 acres, applied to Lord Bathurst for an additional grant, and requested that it might be accompanied with the "usual reservations" for his children. This petition was grounded on the exertions which Mr. Felton had made on his previous allotments; on which, he stated, he had formed a flourishing settlement, and had converted a considerable extent of wilderness into productive and valuable farms. Lord Bathurst admitted the force of these considerations, and instructed the Governor to make to Mr. Felton a further grant of 5,000 acres; adding an authority, framed in close adherence to the language of Mr. Felton's application, for the usual reservation in favour of his children.

In May 1828 Mr. Felton claimed the execution of Lord Bathurst's directions in his favour, and submitted a schedule of the lands which he wished to obtain under that authority; consisting of about 5,000 acres for himself, and of about 1,200 for each of his children. The number of his children was nine.

Sir James Kempt agreed to the demand of 5,000 acres for Mr. Felton himself, but referred to the Secretary of State for instructions respecting the grant to his children. Sir James Kempt observed, that the usual allowance to an ordinary settler was 100, or at most 200 acres; and that 1,200 acres, which Mr. Felton claimed for each of his nine children, was the utmost amount that the Government was at liberty to assign to any one individual. Under these circumstances Sir James declined to accede to the demand, unless he should receive positive directions to that effect from Sir George Murray.

Before proceeding further, I think this a proper place to advert to, and dispose of, that part of Mr. Felton's recent explanation, in which he discusses the reasonableness of his application in the year 1828. This point is by no means of equal importance with others in the case; but since it has been raised, I feel it unnecessary to postpone, to any subsequent part of this review of the circumstances, the declaration