

always been preserved in all its integrity until its introduction into the scheme of Confederation which is proposed to us. Had it not been for the courage and energy displayed by the men of those days, the French element would have lost ground, and its importance would have diminished, so that at last it would have been assimilated by the English element. At that time, our public men already wished for responsible government, and we shall see that the struggle which they carried on for half a century in order to obtain it, was productive of no important result, until they had recourse to rebellion; and it is since that gloomy period of our history that we have our present Constitution and responsible government. Now that we have obtained our most sacred political rights after passing through a century of persecution and through rivers of blood, shed on honorable fields of battle and on the scaffold, are we going to relinquish them in order to accept a new Constitution, the evident object of which is to do away with our influence as a race in this country? Has not the French majority, for fifteen years, always carried its point in the Executive and in the Legislature, thanks to sectional equality in the representation? Why should we then relinquish the advantages conferred upon us by our present Constitution, for a scheme of Confederation in which we shall be in a minority, and which is fraught with danger to us and to our institutions? The responsibility assumed by the French section of the Ministry in uniting the whole of Upper Canada with the English minority of Lower Canada is enormous. And now, at this very time, should that section wish to withdraw from the struggle, perceiving the danger for the future, it could not do so; it would be carried away by the torrent of the English element. It is to shew the danger that exists for the future, Mr. SPEAKER, that I am now presenting a sketch of the struggles of the past. The circumstances which gave rise to them still exist, and will entail the same attempts at aggression; I must say this to stay my countrymen, while there is yet time, on the verge of the abyss towards which they are allowing themselves to be drawn. From 1809 *Le Canadien* discussed, in an animated manner, the question of responsible government, and took to heart the interests of its fellow-countrymen. A cry of violence and treason was raised. But, says GARNÉAU the historian:—

We have carefully perused the journal in ques-

tion, page by page, up to the time of its seizure by the authorities, and we found combined with a demand for rights which were perfectly constitutional, an ever-recurring expression of the most unbounded loyalty and attachment to the English monarchy.

The important question of the voting of the supplies was also the subject of the most violent debates. Mr. BÉDARD insisted on this imprescriptible right of every legislative body under the Crown of England. But it was constantly refused by the English minority in the House and by the Mother Country. Led with greater strength by Mr. BÉDARD, the House by a large majority declared itself in favor of the voting of the supplies by the representatives of the people. In the division which was taken, we find the English element on one side, and the French element on the other. I ask you, Mr. SPEAKER, what rights are left to the British subject if that of voting the supplies is taken from him; if he has not the control of the funds levied from the people for the administration of the affairs of state,—if he is thus deprived of the most important of the privileges which are secured by constitutional government? Is this great injustice to be consummated? Shall the most precious of their rights be refused to the representatives of the people? Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, there will be no shrinking from this infamous proceeding. Our most eminent patriots, those whose eloquent voice on every occasion demanded our threatened liberties, were the first to be accused of treason for having made such a demand, and then confined for fourteen months in the gloomy cells of a prison, regardless of the articles of the capitulation of Montreal, which guaranteed to us the rights and liberties of British subjects. That proposal to vote our public expenditure, which now appears to us so simple, then raised throughout the country a violent tempest, which was never entirely allayed until the annihilation of the existing Constitution. In spite of the rage and calumny which was displayed, Mr. BÉDARD's proposition was carried, and the following is the division upon it:—

IN FAVOR.—Messrs. Bédard, Durocher, T. L. Papineau, LEE, Borgia, Meunier, Taschereau, Viger, Drapeau, Bernier, St. Julien, Hébert, Duclos, Robitaille, Huot, Caron, C. Panet, Le Roi, Blanchet, Debartzch, and Beauchamp—21.

AGAINST.—Messrs. McCord, Bowen, Mure, Bell, DENECHAUD, Jones of Bedford, Blackwood, Gagy, and Ross Cuthbert—9.

A single English name, that of Mr. LEE,