and "disrespectful to Her Majesty," any enquiry which would tend to "exclude under the Act" parties who had been "engaged in the Rebellion."

II. Another line of argument used by debaters on the Ministerial side of the House, was, that it was unjust to withhold compensation from those who had been Rebels, BECAUSE THE INJUSTICE AND OPPRESSION OF THE BRITISH AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HAD OCCASIONED THAT REBELLION.

1. In the debate of the 13th February, the Hon. Francis Hincks, Inspector General, thus defended the Rebellion of 1837 and 1838:—

"The hon. gentleman had shown great indignation against those individuals who had taken up arms in 1837 and 1838, but he would ask who was responsible for disturbances, but the hon. gentleman opposite, and the party whom he supported? (Ironical cheers from the opposition.) Yes! Those were the parties whom he would have held responsible, and he was confirmed in that opinion, by the expressed declarations of two noble lords from England; one of whom had declared explicitly that from the unconstitutional manner in which the Government was carried on, *the people were perfectly justified in taking up arms to oppose it.*"—[*Montreal Pilot*, 14*th February*, 1849.]

2. William Hume Blake, Esq., Solicitor General for Canada West under Your Lordship's present Ministry, spoke as follows, in the debate of the 15th February:—

"From the first period of British interference in the affairs of Lower Canada, up to the time of Lord Durham, every species of oppression was freely practised. The administration of justice was perverted; property was not sacred; and worse still, aye, a thousand times worse, a loyal but contemptible and pitiful minority, seized on every office in the gift of the crown and trampled on men far superior to themselves in every sense of the word."—[*Montreal Pilot*, 16*th February*, 1849.]

3. In another part of the same speech, Mr. Blake, in a tone and spirit which must, I am sure, be repugnant to Your Lordship's feelings, compared the Loyalists of 1837 and 1838, to the Jews, who had hurried "the great founder of our religion to the cross":—

"He had no sympathy with the spurious loyalty of the hon. gentlemen opposite, which, while it trampled on the people, was the slave of Court—a loyalty which, from the dawn of the history of the world down to the present day, had lashed humanity into rebellion. (Cheers.) With such loyalty, he for one could have no sympathy. He would not go to ancient history, but he would tell the hon. gentlemen opposite of one great exhibition of this loyalty; on an occasion when the people of a distant Roman Province contemplated the perpetration of the foulest crime that the page of history records—a crime from which Nature in compassion hid her face and strove to draw a veil over; but the heathen Roman lawgiver could not be induced by perjured witnesses to place the great founder of our religion upon the cross. "I find no fault in him," he said. But these Provincials, after endeavouring by every other means to effect their purpose, had recourse to this spurious loyalty—"If thou lettest this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend." (Cheers.) Mark the loyalty; could they not trace it in this act? aye, and overcome by that mawkish, spurious loyalty, the heathen Roman Governor gave his sanction to a deed whose foul and impure stain eighteen centuries of national humiliation and suffering have been unable to efface. (Cheers.) This spurious, slavish loyalty was not British stuff, (cheers); this spurious, bullying loyalty never grew in his native land. If, after years of struggling to obtain their rights, they found a doctrine so detrimental to the views advanced by the Government, the blame was much lessened, for *it was more deserving of being denounced as rebellious than the efforts to set it aside.* There sit the loyal men, [pointing to the opposite side of the House,] who shed the blood of the people, and trampled on their best and dearest rights."—[*Montreal Pilot*, 16*th February*, 1849.]

4. In the same speech, Mr. Blake asserted that the loyalists who opposed the present Liberal Ministry were the real rebels.

"He would tell those hon. and loyal gentlemen, who were so highly offended the other day at having the term 'rebel' applied to them, that he called them rebels, and they must not expect to receive any apologies from his mouth."—[*Montreal Pilot*, 16*th February*, 1849.]

5. In the course of the debate of the 15th February, the Hon. James Hervey Price, one of Your Lordship's Ministry, thus spoke of the losses occasioned by Her Majesty's troops and the Loyal Militia acting with them:—

"By what right do you refuse to pay for outrages caused by *the Goths and Vandals*, who had desolated the Province from one end to the other? Was it too much to appropriate for such a purpose, not £200,000, as had been repeatedly stated, but £100,000?"—[*Montreal Pilot*, 16*th February*, 1849.]

6. In the debate of the 13th February, Dr. Wolfred Nelson, M. P. P. for Richelieu, one of the principal Generals of the Rebel Forces in 1837, and now one of the supporters of the present Ministry in Parlia-