

say that they presented the scheme as a whole, and would exert all the influence they could bring to bear in the way of argument to induce the House to adopt the scheme without alteration, and for the simple reason that the scheme was not one framed by the Government of Canada, or by the Government of Nova Scotia, but was in the nature of a treaty settled between the different colonies, each clause of which had been fully discussed, and which had been agreed to by a system of mutual compromise. Of course it was competent to the House to vote against the Address as a whole, or to adopt amendments to it, but if they did so, it would then be for the Government to consider whether they would press the scheme further on the attention of the House. It was obvious that unless the scheme were adopted as it had been settled between the different provinces, if they prosecuted it further, they would have to commence *de novo*, and he had no hesitation in expressing his belief that if the scheme was not now adopted in all its principal details, as presented to the House, we could not expect to get it passed this century. It had been only in consequence of a very happy concurrence of circumstances, which might not easily arise again, that the different provinces had been enabled to arrive at the conclusion now presented, and he should exceedingly regret in the interests of Canada and of the future of British North America, if anything should delay beyond this year the completion and conclusion of this great scheme. The resolutions on their face bore evidence of compromise; perhaps not one of the delegates from any of the provinces would have propounded this scheme as a whole, but being impressed with the conviction that it was highly desirable with a view to the maintenance of British power on this continent that there should be Confederation and a junction of all the provinces, the consideration of the details was entered upon in a spirit of compromise. Not one member of the Canadian Government had his own views carried out in all the details, and it was the same with the other delegates. But after a full discussion of sixteen days, and after the various details had been voted on, the resolutions as a whole were agreed to by a unanimous vote; every one of the delegates, whatever his view to any of the details, being satisfied to adopt the whole scheme as adopted by a majority for each individual resolution, and to press it upon his own Legislature as the only practicable scheme that could be carried; such being the case, he

trusted the Government would have the support of a very large majority of the House in carrying the scheme just as it stood, members sacrificing their individual opinions as to particular details, if satisfied with the Government that the scheme as a whole was for the benefit and prosperity of the people of Canada.

HON. MR. HOLTON would like to inquire whether, according to the course of proceeding proposed by the Attorney General, the several resolutions of the Conference would be submitted separately to the House as affirmative propositions?

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said "no." The proposition submitted to the House is that an Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that a bill should be passed based on these resolutions. All amendments might be moved to that one resolution. It would be the same thing, in fact, as to move them upon each resolution separately.

HON. MR. HOLTON held that the Government ought to ask for an affirmative vote from the House on each of these resolutions. They had been prepared and passed by a self-constituted body, without the House or the people ever having been consulted on the subject. Unless the House were a sham altogether, the least reference that could be paid to it would be to obtain a direct affirmation of each of the basis on which the projected Constitution which was hereafter to govern us were to be founded.

HON. MR. CAUCHON wished information as to whether the scheme was to be discussed as a whole, or whether there would be an opportunity given to consider each part of it separately? There were part of the resolutions about which there might be some misunderstanding and difference of opinion, as for example those clauses by one of which it was stated that the civil laws of the country were to be under the control of the local governments, and by the other of which the law of marriage was placed under the control of the General Government. The law of marriage pervaded the whole civil code, and he wanted to know how it could be placed under a different legislature from that which was to regulate the rest of the civil law. He did not, however, see why an affirmative vote on each resolution would enable the House to pronounce with more freedom on these details than the course proposed by the Attorney General.

HON. A. A. DORION said the member for Montmorency misapprehended the scope of the objection made by the member for Chateaus-