

course, to embrace
ins." Let us ex-
se thus given has

duced on the sub-
enough shewn that
Act, every one—
ed to claim com-
on of the few ex-
emendment. From
Vic. c. 76, passed
Canada, previous
en what classes of
e paid under it:—

natural Rebellion, and
ons of, and lawless
e, at various points,
the United States of
his Province sustained
destruction of their
nd property, and by
of their property by
wise; *And whereas*
essentially contributed
rovince, by capturing
by advancing money
ging, clothing, arms
conveyances for the
and by performing
ious ways, for which
id or satisfied, and
ll outstanding: *And*
that all such claims
d satisfied, after the
the manner herein-
Majesty's dutiful and
of Upper Canada, in
ed, therefore humbly
ay be enacted: *And*

Act for the benefit
y not.

the Act authorizes
ssioners—

quire into the losses
jects, and other resi-
y and in consequence
s, and also into the
which have accrued
tion, or damage of
on the part of brig-
the lakes or rivers
United States; and
all ascertain and de-
thereof respectively."

section with the
e Act, as given in

the appendix hereto, in which provision is made (the *only specific provision* in the whole Act) for losses occasioned *by the violence of those acting on behalf of Her Majesty in the suppression of the Rebellion*, will show whether the two Acts are "precisely in the same terms."

By others of the Ministerial supporters it was asserted that the Bill would exactly follow in its provisions the Act passed in 1846, for the payment of the losses in Lower Canada. I annex the Preamble of that Act—*9th Vic., cap. 65*—which proves that it was intended solely for the behalf of the loyal.

"Whereas it is expedient to make provision for the payment of the sums ascertained by the fourth and fifth Reports of the Commissioners appointed under the Ordinance of the Administrator of the Government of the late Province of Lower Canada, and the Special Council for the affairs thereof, passed in the first year of Her Majesty's Reign, and intitled, "*An Ordinance to authorize the appointment of Commissioners to investigate the claims of certain LOYAL Inhabitants of this Province, for Losses sustained during the late unnatural Rebellion*:" Be it therefore enacted, &c.

Had that word, "Loyal,"—a word, my Lord, which has not yet lost its force and meaning with the immense mass of the British population of this Province—had that single word been inserted in Mr. LaFontaine's Resolutions, and in the Bill founded thereon—the measure would have met the cheerful concurrence of every true-hearted Briton in Canada.

The Act of 1846 was passed specially to authorize the issue of Debentures in payment of the claims *already reported on* by the Commissioners appointed under the Ordinance therein recited; while the second section provides that both principal and interest of the Debentures so issued, shall be chargeable—not on the general funds of the Province, but on the "*Marriage License Fund of Lower Canada*." I have searched in vain, both through Mr. LaFontaine's Resolutions and his Bill, for language at all similar to that I have just quoted, and am therefore completely at a loss to know on what grounds

Mr. Solicitor General Blake states, (as he does in the *Montreal Pilot Extra*, of the 26th February last,) that these Resolutions followed the precedent afforded by the previous Administration, "*to the very letter*."

But with regard to the alleged intention of the Conservative Ministry to pay the losses of Rebels, I need scarcely do more than quote the arguments of the Hon. William Morris, President of Your Lordship's previous Executive Council, your official intercourse with whom cannot have failed to impress Your Lordship with a high sense of his honour and honesty, and must consequently give weight and authority to his statements.

In debate in the Legislative Council on the 14th of May last, Mr. Morris made use of the following language:—

"Much had been said respecting the letter of instruction issued from the late Provincial Secretary to the Commissioners, but he could give a *distinct denial to the charge, that the late Government ever intended to pay rebels*; they never intended any such thing, (hear, hear;) and with regard to the letter alluded to, it ought to be borne in mind, that the steps taken at the time the letter was written, were merely preparatory, so that some idea might be formed as to the probable amount which was claimed, so that they could be guided by the claims made as to the actually just and loyal losses. *Had such a principle as paying the losses of those who had rebelled been decided on, he would not for a moment longer have continued a member of the administration*. The claims made at that time, amounted to between £200,000 and £300,000, and the intention of Government was to approximate the claims made, striking off all such as had rebelled; and the only reason of not settling such claims as were just, was because of the large amount required even for that. It was said the present bill was the same as the one passed for the payment of the sufferers by the rebellion in Upper Canada; but that bill was not passed for the payment of the rebellious; and if the late Government had been interrogated respecting their intentions, in the same manner as the present Government had been, the answer would have been 'No, we are not going to pay for rebel losses.'"—[*Montreal Weekly Herald*, 19th May, 1849.]

And again, at a more advanced period of the debate, the same honorable gentleman said, that—

"*He held the same views, while a member of the administration, as he had expressed in his speech, and would rather have left the ministry, than have allowed payment to any one who had been engaged in the rebellion*."—[*Montreal Weekly Herald*, 19th May, 1849.]