

duced by my honorable friends from South Oxford and from Sherbrooke, who, I am sure, do not wish to be taken in in respect to this scheme any more than I do, or than any other man from Upper Canada—I am assured, I say, by them, that our financial position will be benefited by the Confederation. I have compared those facts and those figures, and I must confess I have confidence in their conclusions. (Hear, hear.) I have heard it urged, sir, that because some counties in New Brunswick have rejected the men who have adopted Confederation as a policy, we ought therefore to abandon the scheme. Well, sir, we are either bound in good faith to carry out the engagement entered into at Quebec or not, and I say with my friend the Honorable Attorney General West, we are bound in all conscience and honor, and in every principle of law or equity, to adhere to the agreement entered into. (Hear, hear.) The *tu quoque* argument is not a good defence to such a breach of good faith. What a sorry figure should we cut, sir, before the Imperial Government with this argument in our mouths:—“The Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island broke faith, violated their pledges, were untrue to their engagements, and we followed their example.” I think, sir, such a position would be pitiable, and would tend to lower us in the eyes of the Imperial Government. (Hear, hear.) I maintain that the principle enunciated by my friend the Honorable Attorney General West is correct; we must adopt these resolutions, and we must take them before the Imperial Government, in order to maintain the respect of that Government, in order to maintain the respect of the Empire, in order to maintain even our own self-respect. (Hear, hear.) When that is accomplished, our duty will be ended. If the Maritime Provinces will not adhere to the arrangement, we shall have done our duty, and shall have secured the good-will and respect of the Mother Country. (Hear, hear.) Before taking my seat, I will say, sir, with regard to the putting of the previous question, I am sorry that has been done. I am one who is desirous of giving to every man, of every party, of every shade of political opinion, the most extensive scope for the expression of his opinions, the fairest opportunity of giving them utterance and of recording his votes, so that they may appear upon the *Journals*, ready to be referred

to, in order both to protect himself and to benefit others. This, sir, is, however, a technicality; and however much I may regret that the question has been put in that form, I cannot on that account reject the whole scheme of Confederation. (Hear, hear.)

MR. GEOFFRION said—MR. SPEAKER, when I moved the adjournment last night, it was not my intention to offer to-day a general review of the scheme which is under discussion; for I am of opinion that it has been sufficiently discussed to enable the country to judge of its merits and of its disadvantages. My intention was rather to confine myself to certain points in the plan which, in my opinion, have not been held up in a sufficiently salient point of view, and to make a few remarks on what has been said, both in this House and in the Legislative Council, in relation to the protection of the institutions of Lower Canada. In the Upper House the Hon. the Prime Minister (Hon. Sir ETIENNE PASCAL TACHÉ), in his speech of the 3rd February last, said:—

If we obtain a Federal union, it will be equivalent to a disunion of the provinces, and thereby Lower Canada will preserve her autonomy, together with all the institutions which are so dear to her, and over which she may exercise all the surveillance which is necessary to preserve them from danger.

And the Hon. Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN), after having explained, in his way, the resolutions respecting marriage and divorce, expressed himself as follows, in his speech of the 21st February last:—

This is an important point, and the French-Canadian members ought to congratulate themselves on observing that their fellow-countrymen did not fail in the performance of their duty in relation to a question of such importance. It is needless to say that on many other points some of them will not admit that we performed our duty well; but on the point in question, there can be no difference of opinion, for we have all a common rule, and, I repeat, they should be satisfied that their co-religionists in the Conference were not forgetful of their duty on that occasion.

It then behoves this honorable House, Mr. SPEAKER, to see that our national institutions are really protected by the resolutions which are submitted to us. In order that this end may be fully attained, it is necessary to define the peculiar features of our position as a people. I can say, with the utmost sincerity, that for my part I have