

“ That opinion has further confirmed me in the
“ view taken of the matter, and I was glad to find
“ myself so supported, not professing to be intimately
“ conversant with Lower Canada law. The subject
“ also came in a special manner before the Seigniorial
“ Tenure Commissioners, and there my hon friend
“ (Hon. Mr. De Beaujeu) presented a claim for indem-
“ nification for the loss of his fishing rights, when the
“ Commissioners decided he had not lost them, but
“ that they continued to vest in him as fully and per-
“ fectly as ever, and that consequently he had no
“ claim to compensation. Such being the case with
“ that hon. member's rights, it of course followed that
“ it was likewise the case with all other persons si-
“ milarly situated—at least with all seigniors who had
“ not been compensated for the surrender of rights of
“ this kind.”

The present claimants affirm that they have not received any indemnity whatever for their right of fishing in the Seigniories of Rimouski and Métis.

The Hon. Mr. Campbell added p. 6. “ In Upper
“ Canada the right of fishing was altogether in the
“ hands of the Crown or held by the Crown for the
“ public or for the Indians, and Parliament was
“ therefore at liberty to make such laws on the sub-
“ ject as might be considered desirable.”

It is perhaps the same rule in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but the undersigned has not any opinion to offer in this matter ; the object of this memorial is to show that at least the rule is different in the Province of Quebec, and that the rights of fishing vested in the Seigniors by their titles have been fully recognized and exist still at the present day.