

prior to the Federal union? I replied "Yes, the General Government would be liable for all the debts contracted before this date." "But," says he, "there are certain sums above the sixty-two and a half millions of dollars which will have to be settled as between Upper and Lower Canada. And what will become of the amount due to the seigniors? It may be that Lower Canada will repudiate that portion of the debt so allotted her." Well, I reply, Lower Canada cannot do that, if she were disposed to do so; but I do not believe that Lower Canada would be disposed to repudiate a debt which she has herself contracted—a debt of honor—a debt which is, as it were, sacred. But even if Lower Canada were disposed to do so, the General Government are liable for the amount of that debt; and as the General Government has to give to Lower Canada a subsidy of 80 cents per head, it would, of course, take very good care to subtract from the amount allotted to Lower Canada the interest which is to be paid to the seigniors. (Hear, hear.) So that on that score—I do not know if the hon. gentleman is himself a seignior or not, but he seems to take a great interest in the seigniors—the hon. member need not be uneasy at all.

HON. MR. BUREAU—What I stated was, that under the authority of a public act, special appropriations have been made for the redemption of the debt due to the seigniors, and that the putting aside of that act I consider an act of repudiation. Then, for the sake of argument I stated this, that you are shewing an example of repudiation. But I added that if you were going to pay to Lower Canada what you state, for her Local Government; in the event of her refusing to pay the seigniors, probably the General Government would retain sufficient from the 80 cents per head apportionment for that purpose. I do not wish to push the argument further; and I may state that it was only for the sake of argument that I advanced the proposition.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—No law has been repealed—no repudiation taken place. The seigniors, as it appears to me—I may not have understood the law, for I am no lawyer—will have additional security. That, it seems to me, is a plain fact. (Hear, hear.) Then the hon. member from DeLorimier found a great deal of fault with the manner—I must say the able manner in which the gallant Knight (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU) explained the action of responsible government in this country. The honorable Knight shewed how

responsible government protected the French Catholics in Lower Canada under Confederation, saying that if ever an act of flagrant injustice was to be attempted in the Federal Government, the whole of the Lower Canadians would join as one man, and by uniting with the minority against the Government—because honorable gentlemen must know that there always will be minorities—by means of thus strengthening the minority any Administration could be ousted out of their places in twenty-four hours. My honorable friend stated this, and he stated it justly; he said so, well aware of what he was saying. But the honorable gentleman from DeLorimier comes forward and says: "Don't you recollect that at one time the Upper Canadians, with the minority from Lower Canada, united to impose upon Lower Canada their will?" I tell you, honorable gentlemen, that they never did harm to Lower Canada, and that they never could do harm to Lower Canada had they so chosen. And why? The French had the use of their own language conceded to them in order to bring them to support the Government, and much more would have been done to accomplish the same end. I am referring now to the Government of the day from 1844 to 1848. That Government would have given you, what was passed afterwards, an act to secure to the sufferers the payment of their losses, the Rebellion Losses Bill.—They would have given every shilling of those losses, and they would have given you more if you would have consented to become their followers. The honorable gentleman made out no case at all, and he could not have studied parliamentary history since 1841 correctly. Had he done so, he would have found that at that period what was called responsible government was not worked out. Sir CHARLES BAGOT, it is true, had lent himself to the views of his advisers, and responsible government had been going on perfectly under him; but then he died here, and honorable gentlemen must understand that Lord METCALF was opposed to responsible government.

HON. MR. BUREAU—Still we had responsible government.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—You had it in name only, but not in practice; otherwise Hon. Mr. BALDWIN and Hon. Mr. LAFONTAINE would never have left the Cabinet. They resigned their seats in Council because they held themselves responsible to Parliament, while Lord METCALF chose to appoint persons to office without consulting them, as his constitutional