In the same letter the Captain went on to say that Pritchard's assertions contradicted his former conduct and conversation, but he believed that Pritchard heartily repented and would not in the future oppose measures recommended by the government. Referring to the impending migration of the Loyalists to the new lands up the St. Lawrence, Sherwood wrote, "I hope and pray that the removal of the Loyalists may soon take place, and I heartily wish His Excellency may be at Sorel at the time of the general rendezvous, as I think His presence would strike a damp on those turbulent spirits who I know are determined to make a disturbance."

This spirit of discontent among the Loyalists and the opposition to the Cataraqui project increased as the day (May 24th) approached for the general rendezvous at Sorel. The feeling was fomented not only by malcontents but also by owners of seigniories with an interest in attracting settlers to their own properties. As has been noted, the promoters of the Missisquoi Bay settlement had circularized the Loyalist cantonments at St. Johns, Sorel, Machiche, and Montreal in an effort to dispose of their surplus lands. Other proprietors conspicuous in this activity were Captain Ross and Dr. Moseley, who had come from New York in the early spring with the intention of securing a tract of land suitable for a large settlement; they had at first petitioned for a grant between Missisquoi Bay and the Connecticut River, had then negotiated with the holders of Levasseur's old title, and had finally ended by purchasing a seigniory at Yamaska.

Among those who could be classed as malcontents was John Peters, who had figured so prominently in the Burgoyne campaign. Returning to Canada after the campaign of 1777, Peters had been unfortunate enough to incur the ill will of General Haldimand, and as a result his fortunes had steadily declined. In addition to undergoing the humiliation of a demotion, he had been unsuccessful in securing a settlement from the government of certain monetary claims arising from expenses incidental to the raising of the "Queens Loyal Rangers," the Provincial corps that he had commanded under Burgoyne. At this period John Peters presented the picture of a thoroughly disgruntled and embittered man, ready to grasp at any straw to retrieve his fallen fortunes.

During the latter part of April an anonymous petition addressed to the Loyalists in Canada and designed to embarrass the government

in its Cataraqui venture, was in circulation through the cantonments. In this document the Loyalists were called upon to assert their right, given under Lord North’s proclamation, to settle in places of their own choice. “It was a little hard,” the text ran, “to be obliged to take the King’s lands under worse terms than could be obtained from the French seigniors, and if those hard terms were not accepted in a locality selected by General Haldimand, on the advice of some few interested and designing men, they were threatened with the loss of their provisions and other allowances from the government, by these same men.” Then followed an appeal to the Loyalists to draw up a petition to the commander-in-chief incorporating their desires, and to forward it to “A.Z.” at Quebec where it would be backed by the best gentlemen in the province. Provisions were to be promised and encouragement offered by M. de Lanaudiere and others. The petition was signed, “your Friend and one of you, A.Z.”

A copy of this petition was obtained by stealth by Captain Pritchard and placed in the hands of Sherwood, who communicated its contents to headquarters. Naturally, the government was disturbed, and anxious to learn the identity of the authors of this seditious document. By a combination of stratagem and force, the Secret Service was shortly able to secure the original, which had been taken from Peters to Montreal by Moseley, and thence to St. Johns by one Allen.

Referring to this affair, Captain Sherwood wrote on May 13th that Mr. Man had been given the “insidious original” which was in Colonel Peters’ handwriting and spelling, although the diction did not appear to be entirely his. Sherwood continued, “It appears plain from Dr. Moseley & Pritchard that the seigniors in Canada are at the head of the scheme, indeed Moseley owned it and said it was for their interest to settle their own lands with the Loyalists, that the lands and terms offered by Government pointed out nothing but chains of slavery, that there was nothing but oppression in this Province, that the liberty of the press is taken from us and we need never expect to enjoy, in this province, the usual privileges of British subjects—in short, I am convinced that Moseley is a principal and one of the most active in this rebellious scheme, they have their Emissaries in every Cantonment. At St. Johns, Mr. Wehr, Alexr. Taylor and John Martin (low fellows) are foremost; at Machiche, Hobson and Case; at Duchene, Sergeant Ward, Peter Mills and some others;


[ 129 ]
Ward and Mills are now at this place blowing the coals of sedition like two furies.”

The conditions referred to in Sherwood’s letter seemed to constitute a strong indictment of Haldimand’s administration, indicating a situation not unlike that which prevailed in the revolted colonies just prior to the outbreak of the Revolution. Certainly, many of the Loyalists were no more quiescent under the rule of a despotic, military government than those who had brought about the political separation of the colonies from the Empire. Fundamentally, the Loyalists differed little in temperament from the people they had left on the other side of the border; they were both quick to protest what they considered to be arbitrary and illegal abuse of authority.

Nevertheless, the rendezvous of the Loyalists at Sorel on May 24th and their departure thence for the new lands up the St. Lawrence took place quietly and without disturbance; with the exception of the few small groups remaining at Sorel, St. Johns, Caldwell’s Manor, and Missisquoi Bay, the Loyalist population in the lower part of the province was transferred bodily to the territory that later became Upper Canada. It was an ambitious undertaking successfully carried out, and, as it later proved, with the most fortunate consequences, completely vindicating the wisdom of General Haldimand’s judgment and courage.

CHAPTER XIII. Lands without Manna

MEANWHILE, the Loyalists at Missisquoi Bay were still tenaciously clinging to “them Indian lands.” On April 29th Mathews had written to Major Jessup, Loyal Rangers, again positively refusing to allow a settlement at that place and directing that those who persisted and refused to settle with the rest, were to have their allowances stopped on the very day (May 24th) that the others should depart.¹

Jessup replied on May 9th that he had communicated the Governor’s decision, but that the two Captains Jones and the Man brothers had been busy getting a paper signed by people to go to Missisquoi Bay.² On June 1st he reported that many of those who intended to go to Missisquoi Bay had changed their minds but that some still persisted.³

Just why the drastic measures mentioned in previous orders to Major Campbell were not carried out, does not appear; presumably, His Excellency's bark was worse than his bite. However, with the departure of the great body of the Loyalists on May 24th the provision allowances of those at Missisquoi Bay were automatically stopped, as the government had no authority to continue them except to settlers on Crown Lands. On May 17th Major Campbell received orders from Mathews that after the departure of the Loyalists to their settlements, not a single ration was to be issued, with exceptions pointed out.

On June 30th Christian Wehr wrote to Mathews from St. Johns complaining that Mr. John Man, commissary at that place for the Loyalists, notwithstanding the orders of Mr. DeLancey, had not thought proper to issue provisions since May 24th except to a few particular families. He, therefore, requested that the commander-in-chief issue orders to Mr. Man to give provisions to all Loyalists in the District, at least for so long until they could gather their little harvests, for every one of them had more or less of one necessary thing or other in the ground. He had been waiting at St. Johns to bring in horses and cattle of his father-in-law, had also planted and sowed considerable, wherefore, he begged that his family be allowed to draw their provisions with the rest at that place.

Seven months after, these Loyalists were still at Missisquoi Bay, and still without provisions. On February 7, 1785, Christian Wehr once again addressed a memorial to headquarters, this time to Lieutenant Governor Henry Hamilton, General Haldimand having returned to England. This document, typically "Wehresque" in style, has one sentence containing three hundred and thirty-six words; it has been reproduced before but is well worth the trouble again. It follows:

To His Excellency Henry Hammelton, Esq., Governor in and over the Province of Quebec and Territorys thereunto belonging.

The Petition of the Subscribers humbly sheweth

That the fift day of Octr. in the Year of our Lord, 1783, we, with many others Petitioned His Excellence, Fridrick Haldemand, Esqr.,

4. Ibid., 1886, p. 443.
the then Governor, and Commander in Chief, for a tract of land
East of Missisquie Bay, for Each of us there to receive his Portion of
land, allowed by Government for services but not Receiving an An-
swer to our Petition until late in the Winter Fallowing, and we be-
ing Desirous, to Git in some way of Living again, and to retrieve a
little our Losses (by Cultivation) which we suffered During the un-
happy troubles in North America which losses were very considerable
with some of us, and very sorely Feel'd by Every One of us and Your
humble Petitioners would not be under necessity of troubleing you,
for they at present what they have lost, and were opleged to leave in
the hands of the Enemy, since they from the beginning of the late
troubles in America, adhered to British Government, and joined
the British forces in the Year 1777, but since, as above mentioned,
were desireous to git into some way of living, we bought a tract of
land of Mr. Robertson of St. Johns, and some of us settled thereon
before Ever his Excellence Fridrick Haldemand, Esqr., the late Com-
mander in Chief had Given Orders or Pointed out Places for the set-
ting of Loyalists, but so it was, that since some of us settled at the Bay
of Missisquie, and Others could not move when the orders came
out for to settle at the apointed Places by Reason of Sickness, and
Other hindrance in their Families, and all of us hoping that we
should Yet Git the land in the Parts we Petitioned for, but so it was,
since we did not Go, to the Place or Places pointed at, we were
struck of the Provisions list, part of us since the 24th of May last,
the Others at Different times After, but all of us since the 24th.
Octr. last. Wherefore we most Humbly beg of your Excellence in
your Clemency, and love to Your Fellow Men, who have sorely suf-
fered During the late Rebellion both in body and Estate, and Order
that the Provision and Other Donations Allowed to Loyalists, by
Government, Should be given to us from the time that Every one of
us, and Families were struck off the Provision list. And we humbly
beg your Excellence will Please to Condescend, to favor us with an
Answer, Whether we Shall have Provision, Or no, for it is our Opinion
that all Loyalists, Settling in the Province of Quebec, are Allowed
Provision wether on Kings Land or not, if within the Province line.
Moreover, we humbly beg to inform your Excellence, that We little
Expected, Nither do we think, that it is Governments intention, or
any Order, from our Most Gracious King, and his Parliament, that all
such of his true and faithful Subjects as Your Petitioners, Should be
struck off of all bennefits from Government, as Donations of Provs,
and Other Things, allowed by Government. Except such and only such, who settle in them Particular Places, which Perhaps through the Indication of Selfe interested Gentlemen, has been put into the head of the late Commander in Chief, to Pointe out for Settling of the Loyalists in the Province of Quebec, Furthere more, we doubt, Yea, we are most sure, that there is some underhand Dealings with the kings Prov's, by them who have the posts for Giveing orders for the Loyalists Prov's. as for instance at St. Johns &c., For we sent a Petition to Your Excellence Dece. last and Never hear'd thereof, Wherefore we beg Your Excellence will Please to Condescend to Derect Your Answer to Chm. Wehr Lieut. Royl. Yorkers at Missisquie Bay, and to the care of Mr. Alexr. Taylor at St. Johns, and if Your Excellence will most Graciously Please to Grant us our Petition, Your Petitioners as in duty bound Shall Ever Pray,

sd. Christian Wehr
Conrade Best
Christian Haver
John Ruiter
Adam Deal
John Cole
Ludwig Streit
George Feller
Jasemind Drow
Lodwik Strit, Junr.
Jacob Thomas
Philip Ruiter
John Van Vorst
James Henderson
Alexr. Taylor

Missisquie Bay, Feb. 7th, 1785.7

These signatures show a marked change in the composition of the Missisquoi Bay group. Of the original eleven, only four remained, namely, Christian Wehr, Conrad Best, John Ruiter, and Alexander Taylor. George Feller and James Henderson had been named in a previous list (Wehr’s letter of April 27th), while Philip Ruiter was the son of Captain Henry Ruiter, and Christian Haver the father-in-law of Lieutenant Wehr. The remainder, probably those who

“could not move when the orderes came out for to setle at the apointed Places by Reason of Sickness, and Othere Hindrance in their Families,” are mentioned for the first time. The marked preponderance of Teutonic names is significant, and accounted for by the composition of the population on the Champlain frontier of New York, whence most of these settlers came.

It is evident from this document and from some of the preceding correspondence as well, that the Missisquoi Loyalists were unable to conceive that Haldimand’s opposition to their settlement was based on grounds of broad public policy, and could account for it only on the theory that it was inspired by some self-interested motive, on the part either of the commander-in-chief or of his advisers. In fairness to this point of view it may be said that Haldimand had been instructed to victual the Loyalists until May 1, 1786, and that the interpretation of this order, restricting such victualing to settlers on Crown lands, seems to have been his own. Lieutenant Wehr’s petition was transmitted to the Ministry by Lieutenant Governor Hamilton, together with remarks concerning Haldimand’s interpretation as above stated, and on August 22, 1785, Brigadier General Hope, who had succeeded Hamilton, was advised by Sydney that Loyalists on private lands were to have an equal share of the royal bounty with those on Crown lands. Furthermore, the Missisquoi settlers were shortly to experience more trouble, and from a man who had been high in the councils of General Haldimand.

It will be recalled that the title to the seigniory of St. Armand had descended to William McKenzie, Benjamin Price, James Moore, and George Fulton, or to their beneficiaries. On April 4, 1786, James Moore purchased the shares that had belonged to William McKenzie and Benjamin Price; on the July 4th following he sold his three-quarter interest to Thomas Dunn, who on February 11, 1787, purchased the remaining quarter from the legatees of George Fulton. Thomas Dunn, on May 12, 1789, was recorded as the proprietor of the fief and seigniory of St. Armand, a title that remained in the possession of his heirs as late as December 1, 1860.

The Hon. Thomas Dunn was a prominent citizen of Quebec.
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Born in Durham, England, in 1731, he had come to Canada shortly after the conquest, where he had been successful in mercantile affairs. Later he became a judge of the court of Queen’s Bench and was appointed by Carleton to the Legislative Council in 1775. Under Haldimand he had filled various offices, including that of Paymaster General of the Marine Department. In 1805, Thomas Dunn, as senior Executive Councillor, took office as acting Lieutenant Governor on the departure of Milnes.

To a man of Dunn’s standing and connections it was not a difficult matter to make good his ownership and possession against the people who had settled “them Indian lands” merely on the strength of James Robertson’s lease. In consequence, the Missisquoi settlers were forced to repurchase their lands from the new owner, Captain Henry Ruiter acting as resident agent for Mr. Dunn.

The original of one of the deeds by which the land was reconveyed to the early settlers is still preserved at Missisquoi Bay. It is a printed form, indicating the extent of Mr. Dunn’s holdings. This particular document was dated June 8, 1792, in the house of John Ruiter, Esq., on Missisquoi in Lake Champlain, between the Hon. Thomas Dunn of Quebec, proprietor of the fief and seigniory of St. Armand, and Charles Miller, residing on the said seigniory. In consideration of the payment of twenty pounds, Dunn conveyed to Miller the lot numbered 21 on a plan drawn by Caleb Henderson, surveyor, containing some two hundred and ten acres, more or less; the conveyance was made subject to a quit rent of two shillings annually forever, in return for which the proprietor waived all other rights and dues usually associated with the seigniorial tenure. The witnesses were Patrick Conway and Henry Ruiter. There was also an addendum dated August 31, 1796, acknowledging the receipt of ten shillings lawful money in full payment for five acres of land contained in the aforesaid lot, more than the two hundred and ten acres mentioned in the foregoing deed. From this it will be seen that Dunn sold his land for two shillings per acre.

The above-mentioned Charles Miller was the son of the Peter Miller who had joined Carleton at Crown Point in 1776, had then served under Peters and MacKay in 1777, and thereafter with Captain Leake. In the fall of 1784 he had come to Missisquoi Bay with his son-in-law, where they had purchased adjoining lots from the proprietors under the Indian lease. Peter Miller, in March 1792, had deeded the property to his son Charles, who had thus been under
the disagreeable necessity of repurchasing from Thomas Dunn some three months later.

With the new titles obtained from Dunn, the troubles of the Missisquoi Loyalists seem to have ended, but not many of the original settlers remained for long in the vicinity. Some, after all the bother, left for Upper Canada while others went to the new Eastern Townships when that district was opened for settlement a few years later. Not a few crossed the line into the adjacent Vermont towns, where they apparently experienced no difficulty in attaining a good standing among their erstwhile enemies. Curiously enough, the anticipated “frontier incidents” that had so influenced the policy of General Haldimand, failed to materialize except for some minor affairs in which the St. Francis Indians and Ira Allen’s settlers were concerned.

It appears that after Allen had successfully contested Simon Metcalfe’s attempt to reassert his old claim to the lands on the Missisquoi River, that he was confronted with a forcible entry on the part of a Captain Hunter and Mr. Grajon of St. Johns, in virtue of an Indian lease dated in the year 1765 (evidently that of old Mr. Robertson). Although Allen denied the validity of this lease, it was mutually agreed that the question should be settled by the courts; the resulting suit terminating in Ira Allen’s favor, “Captain Hunter appeared to be very high, making use of many improper expressions, such as that the lands must be fought for, that the Indians would assert their rights, and insinuating that a scalping match would ensue.”

The Abenakis, despite the fact that they had abandoned the locality many years before, had not been able to reconcile themselves to the loss of their Missisquoi lands, and made occasional visits to the neighborhood while engaged on periodic fishing and fowling excursions on the Lake. As it happened, shortly after the foregoing incident a number of them appeared at Swanton where they advanced a claim to ownership and terrorized the inhabitants.

Ira Allen wrote to General Haldimand in September, 1784, complaining of these outrages and enclosing a number of depositions confirming the allegations. He asked that some measures might be taken to prevent further ravages by the Indians, generously adding that he had no objection to the Abenakis having a fair trial at law for any right that they might suppose to possess. Mathews replied that
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His Excellency would do all in his power to prevent misunderstandings between the frontier settlers.  

A few days later Ira Allen renewed his complaint of further outrages instigated by the “diabolical machinations of some individuals residing at St. Johns,” and enclosing additional depositions. John Johnson testified that the Indians had come to Swanton with an interpreter and had warned the inhabitants to move or they would burn their houses and kill the cattle. A settler replying that the land belonged to Colonel Allen, the Indian chief drew his knife and threatened to scalp Colonel Allen; whereupon the Abenakis had helped themselves to one sheep and several canoe-loads of corn and beans in lieu of rent. According to Jonathan Butterfield, James Hunter of St. Johns had sworn in his presence that if Colonel Allen came to that place, that he would put a ball in his head or place him in irons under guard. Thomas Butterfield averred that he had heard the same James Hunter swear that he would send the Indians to burn all the houses, kill the cattle, and drive Colonel Allen’s people from the River.

To this second letter Mathews replied on October 11, 1784, that orders had been given to investigate the causes of the dispute on the spot, and at the same time he wrote to Lieutenant Colonel Campbell at St. Johns, desiring him to examine into the disputes between the St. Francis Indians and Ira Allen’s settlers. Colonel Campbell’s interposition proving effective, all was quiet and serene at Swanton for several years.

However, in 1788, the Indians gave some further trouble and Ira Allen addressed his complaints to Sir Guy Carleton, who had returned to Canada as Governor General. Colonel Campbell was again called upon to intervene, through an order from Sir John Johnson, Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. In this instance, the two complainants, John Waggoner and William Tichout, with their interpreter, John Hilliker, declined a personal meeting with the Indians concerned, for which Colonel Campbell presumed to think unfavorably of their complaint. As a matter of fact, all three of these men, Waggoner, Tichout, and Hilliker, were Loyalists and ex-Loyal Rangers who had settled in Vermont.
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With the passage of years, a marked change in the character of the population took place at Missisquoi Bay. The descendants of the remaining original settlers, and of the English-speaking people who had come in after, gradually removed from the district. Their places were taken by inhabitants of the parishes to the northward, and it is interesting to observe that, to-day, the region has become as General Haldimand in 1783 intended that it should, predominantly a community of French Canadians.
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POSTSCRIPT

I N the tedious process of unraveling the tangled skein of the lives of the New England Loyalists who had every reason to believe that the British government represented a stable force and the American Revolution an abortive attempt to challenge it, the historian must not lose sight of the moves and countermoves of the principal leaders who were making history; but I confess to an abiding interest in the Loyalists' ambitions and destiny as a dramatic and human story. It seems to me that Mr. Lampee has sketched with the impersonal touch of the historian not only the forces that functioned in creating the Missisquoi Loyalists, but he has, also, caught an undertone the human values. Certainly, the men, and indirectly the women, who came under the scheme of his research in his brief but competent study reflect the old motives that actuated them long ago and are recovered for us from the deepening shadows of a vanished century.

One of these days, of course, the novelist and playwright, possibly the poet, will turn to such themes as lie in studies like this by Mr. Lampee for literary ore that holds high dramatic and story values. The assumption of a century ago and less that the Loyalists were a benighted class and outright traitors has faded; and the true picture of them as men and women, sacrificing homes and lands and old associations, suffering privation and distress of varying kinds, and in many cases dying for a cause in which they believed, is beginning to focus dimly in the popular mind.

Mr. Lampee belongs to that interesting class of American business men who turn from business to some phase of historical research as an avocation and then find they are entering a vocation. He is a graduate of Dartmouth College where his major courses were taken in the Department of History. His interest in the Missisquoi Loyalists was primarily genealogical, as one of his ancestors was a member of that stubborn group who showed such "indecent perseverance" in settling at Missisquoi Bay, and the farm that he cleared is still in the family. That early interest grew into a definite research project, and The Missisquoi Loyalists is the result. Correspondence intended for Mr. Lampee should be addressed as follows—Mr. Thomas C. Lampee, 1246 Commonwealth Avenue, Allston, Massachusetts.
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