

fully. Those who are now in power have on their side the people and the ecclesiastical authorities, whom you would use as a stalking horse in your campaign against Confederation. All your efforts, all your tricks, will not succeed in shaking the confidence of the people in their representatives. You talk of public meetings, of the people's opinion, petitions, &c., but why did you not call these meetings when the members were at home in their counties, when they might have met you face to face? You waited, like cowards, till they had come here to attend their duties in this House, and set hireling agents to work to get up those meetings, expecting an easy victory. We know perfectly well, for we have proofs, that agents well paid by a political committee at Montreal, were sent to all the parishes to get up meetings against Confederation, at which they made use of the most contradictory arguments, varied as occasion required, to suit their object, which was to induce the people to declare against the scheme, and sign petitions accordingly. (Hear, hear.) These petitions bear the names of children, and, in fact, of sucklings, as was proved the other day by the honorable member for Boucherville. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) And if that much is certain, we are justified in thinking that those agents must have done something still worse, with which we are not acquainted, for the purpose of prejudicing the people against the Government scheme. Now, I say that in view of all this—in view of all this underhand trickery and hypocrisy of the Opposition—all French-Canadians should unite together in support of a just, frank and straightforward measure, such as that now submitted to this House. Was it not stated, long before the meeting of Parliament, that the measure should receive a calm and fair consideration? And yet since the beginning of the discussion we have had nothing but appeals to prejudice made by the adversaries of the measure, in place of discussing it on its merits, as they ought to have done. The honorable member for Richelieu (Mr. PERRAULT) has distinguished himself in the way of appealing to national and religious prejudices, and in order to attain his object he cited facts long past—drawn, in fact, from ancient history. We all know the facts he mentioned; but why cite them as he did in such a body as this? It is neither politic nor right. Our duty as members of this House is to make laws for the well-being and prosperity of the country and of all

classes of the population, and not to excite the hatred and prejudices of one section of the community against another section. (Hear, hear.) Then, again, what was the gist of the speech just made by the honorable member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. J. B. E. DORION)—who certainly, I must admit, possesses oratorical ability, as well as other gifts? It was just simply a comparison between our Government and that of the United States, and of course he gave the preference to the latter. The honorable member is never weary of looking to Washington with one eye. (Hear, hear.) Why does not the honorable member tell us frankly at once that he desires the annexation of Canada to the United States? For, if we are to believe his statements, the American Government is an extraordinary government, a model government, a government unequalled in the world! But no; instead of giving us the benefit of his real thoughts, he stops short at insinuations, and comparisons of the expenditure attending the two forms of government, in order to leave an impression on the minds of the people. (Hear, hear.) Another hon. member of this House, who is not in the habit of appealing to the religious or national prejudices of the people—the hon. member for Bagot (Hon. Mr. LAFRAMBOISE)—has thought proper, this evening, to join in the outcry of the Opposition on this subject. He cited an event which has just occurred at Toronto, and which everybody regrets, and used it as an argument against the scheme of Confederation submitted to us by the Government. Why drag that fact into the discussion of a great question, and at a solemn moment like this? I do think that it was hardly becoming in an honorable ex-minister of the Crown to say to this House,—“Two sisters of charity have been insulted in the streets of Toronto; *ergo*, sisters of charity will not be tolerated under Confederation; the clergy will be persecuted, and religion annihilated.” But this style of argument is resorted to somewhat too tardily. These protestations of devotedness to religion and to the clergy come too late to be believed by the people of Lower Canada, or to make any impression on them. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Richelieu also indulged in insinuations against the Honorable President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN), and stated that he was still as great a fanatic as ever against our religion and our clergy. Certainly, the Honorable President of the Council was wrong in speaking as he formerly did,