

f 1837 and 1838 by
 their supporters in
 ; and I beg leave
 Lordship, whether
 language as this—lan-
 gle member of the
 d, without the sa-
 istency, or justice,
 or the “outrages
 Vandals” on those
 o, “lashed into re-
 s, slavish, bullying
 ible and pitiful mi-
 ants,” took up arms
 “justifiable course

argument were those
 ministerial benches,
 to pay the losses of
 e assertion—which
 e—that they were
 n of the previous
 older genius ocea-
 n the beaten track
 nt which had at
 s that used by Mr.
 the 10th February
 ight have had some
 to tax the loyal in
 n resisted on mere
 nd not, as it really
 nciples of honour,

Canada the question is
 The losses of parties
 e just by Sir Allan
 and who never were
 ould amount to more
 most amount that it
 tical effect, therefore,
 e, would simply be to
 unt payable to the
 Pilot, Extra, 26th Feb.,

claims submitted to
 y was, I believe,
 which £100,000,
 were claimed by

parties who had taken no part against the Go-
 vernment during the Rebellion. Now what
 other interpretation can possibly be affixed to
 Mr. Hincks' words than that out of every five
 shillings admitted to be due for these just
 claims, three were to be taken to indemnify
 those who *had* aided in the Rebellion?*

In addition to the various arguments thus
 tacitly implied or openly avowed, to justify
 the payment of Rebels, I am able to submit
 to Your Lordship two other classes of proofs
 in support of my assertion that such was the
 intention of the Ministry.

I. The first of these classes is to be found
 in the numerous instances where questions
 were put directly to the Ministers, relative
 to their intentions, and where their silence
 leaves not a shadow of a doubt in any unpre-
 judiced mind, that *they did intend to pay Rebels*.

1. During the debate of the 13th Feb-
 ruary, Henry Smith, Esq., M.P.P. for Fron-
 tenac, in opposing Mr. LaFontaine's Resolu-
 tions, thus questioned the Ministerialists:—

“He would rather die than vote for paying such
 claims as these. He said one of these, amounting to
 £23,000, was for one of the leaders of the rebellion.
*Would any hon. member from Upper Canada vote for
 paying that?*—[No one answered.] Now there were
 certain just claims that ought to be paid, but he
 would never consent to pay those who first got up
 rebellion and afterwards lost by it.”—[*Montreal
 Pilot, 14th February, 1849.*]

2. A similar question was put that evening
 by the Hon. Henry Sherwood, M.P.P. for
 Toronto, to Messrs. LaFontaine and Baldwin:

“Perhaps a great deal of that discussion might be
 prevented if the hon. Attorneys General would rise
 in their places, and say that *it was not intended to pay
 the claims of those parties who had taken part in the
 rebellion*. If they still kept silent, he would be justi-
 fied in supposing that it was intended to do so. (No
 reply.)”—[*Montreal Pilot, 14th Feb., 1849.*]

3. During the same debate, the question
 was repeated by Col. Gagy, M. P. P. for
 Sherbrooke:—

“As to the Resolutions before the House, he
 would ask the Members of the Administration one
 question, and if answered satisfactorily he would
 give them his support. *Did they mean to limit the
 compensation to loyal men?* He paused for a reply.
 (The hon. gentleman stopped for a few minutes.)

*See Postscript, Page 16.

There was no answer—he could form his own con-
 clusions.”—[*Montreal Gazette, 14th Feb., 1849.*]

I may here remark, my Lord, that I have
 hitherto taken every extract in this
 letter from the *Montreal Pilot*, a thorough
 supporter of the Ministerial policy, and
 whose authority cannot well be disputed by
 Your Lordship's Advisers—the more espe-
 cially, as at the period to which I refer, and,
 indeed, until a few weeks ago, it was the
 property of the Hon. Mr. Hincks, Inspector
 General. In the last case, however, I have
 been compelled to quote from another paper,
 the only report contained in the *Pilot* (14th
 February) being—“Mr. Gagy followed in
 favour of the amendment.” I am obliged,
 for a similar reason, to recur to the same
 source for the next extract I have to present.

4. On the sixth of March, when the Bill
 was in Committee, the following pointed
 questions were put by Col. Prince, M. P. P.
 for Essex, but, like those previously given,
 they were of no avail in eliciting an an-
 swer:—

“Col. PRINCE stated that a great deal of uncertainty
 existed as to the class of persons whom it was in-
 tended by the Ministry to pay, under the measure
 introduced by them, and he begged Mr. Attorney
 General LaFontaine to settle the matter explicitly, by
 replying to certain questions which he would put to
 him. Col. Prince promised, on his part, to regard
 the replies as final, and after receiving them, would
 allude no further to the Rebellion claims.”

He then put the following questions in a deliber-
 ate, solemn manner, pausing between each for an
 answer.

Do you propose to exclude, in your instructions to
 the Commissioners to be appointed under this Act,
 all who aided and abetted in the Rebellion of 1837,
 1838?—No reply.

Do you propose to exclude those who, by their
 admissions and confessions, admitted their participa-
 tion in the Rebellion?—No reply.

Do you mean to exclude those whose admission of
 guilt, is at this very moment in the possession of the
 Government, or of the Courts of Law, unless these
 admissions have been destroyed with the connivance
 of hon. gentlemen opposite?—No reply.

Do you mean to exclude any of those 800 men
 who were imprisoned in the Gaol of Montreal, for
 their participation in the Rebellion, and who were
 subsequently discharged from custody through the
 clemency of the Government, and whose claims I un-
 derstand to exceed some £70,000?—No reply.

Do you not mean to pay every one, let his participa-
 tion in the Rebellion have been what it may, except the
 very few who were convicted by the Courts Martial