

tleman (Hon. Mr. DORION) has told us that the meeting of the county of Laval, which was held before the session, had been scarcely advertised, and that I had not ventured to put the question of Confederation on its trial. I beg to remark, sir, that the honorable member is not candid in making this assertion, and is ignorant of what did really occur. The meeting of the county of Laval was announced at the doors of the several churches in the county; afterwards an influential person in each parish, after mass on the feast of the Epiphany, urged the electors, one and all, to attend the important meeting at which the question of Confederation was to be taken into consideration. The opponents of the measure were invited to meet me, as I can sufficiently prove in due time and place, but their hearts failed them—none came. At that meeting, composed of a majority of my constituents, I stated at great length all that the opponents of the project had to say against it, and the reasons which its friends and advocates had to advance in its favor. I then asked to be informed of the views of the electors. They desired me to give my own on the subject. I declared that unless the sense of the county was opposed to the measure, I was inclined to give it my support. This declaration was followed by an unanimous vote, approving of my conduct in Parliament, and declaring that having full confidence in me, they left me at full liberty to vote according to my conscience on this great measure. Let the hon. member deny this if he can. The hon. member (Hon. Mr. DORION) has stated "that it was not right to change the Constitution without an appeal to the decision of the people." As a complete answer to that assertion, I shall quote the words spoken by the honorable gentleman on the 2nd February, 1859—"If he (HON. MR. DORION) had remained in power, he would have proposed a measure for the settlement of the representation question, and would have submitted it to the decision of the House," &c., &c. Has not the honorable member changed his opinions? When a member of the Government in 1858, he did not admit that the people had the right to be consulted on the constitutional changes he wished to propose; but as a Leader of the Opposition, in 1865, he refuses to the Legislature the right of effecting such changes without an appeal to the people: *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis*. What a contradiction! Such is the effect of party spirit. The honorable member for Hochelaga says, "that he had been accused of having

been in favor of a Confederation of all the provinces of British North America, but he peremptorily denied the truth of that statement; on the contrary, he had always opposed that union as a measure calculated to bring us into trouble and to create embarrassment." Mr. SPEAKER, either the honorable gentleman's logic or else his sincerity is at fault. Let us examine. On reading over the speeches cited by himself in support of his denial, what do I find? "A time will perhaps come when the Confederation of all the provinces will be necessary, but I am not in favor of it at this moment." Further on I find: "I trust the time will come when it will be desirable for the Canadas to unite federatively with the Lower Provinces, but the time has not yet arrived for such a measure."—(Speech of 3rd May, 1860.) Now what is the conclusion, the only logical conclusion to be deduced from the honorable member's words? None other than the following: that in all these instances he declared himself in favor of a Confederation of all the provinces, sooner or later. The honorable member therefore deceived his electors when he said to them in his manifesto of the 7th November last: "Every time I have had an opportunity I have invariably expressed myself opposed to any union, whether Legislative or Federal, with the Maritime Provinces." He wished, therefore, to mislead this House, when in his speech at the commencement of this debate he attempted to show that he had been wrongfully accused on that point, and that the expressions he had used had been tortured into every shape in order to establish the attacks made upon him. In the political letter of the honorable member to his constituents, to which I alluded a moment ago, I find the following words: "The proposed union appears to me to be premature." If the words have any meaning at all, do they not prove that the honorable member admitted the necessity of such a union sooner or later? The honorable member was therefore not sincere when he wrote to his electors that he was always opposed to the Confederation of the provinces of British North America. (Hear.) The honorable gentleman stated "that he could not understand how Confederation could increase our means of defence, * * * * * that if the union brought any advantage in that respect, the Maritime Provinces and not Canada would reap the benefit." If the honorable member had taken the trouble to study the question, I think he would have arrived at a different