

in it is that it should be imputed to you,—that it should be you, you, of all the politicians perhaps in this Chamber, who by your language had given the least cause to think that you had committed acts of this sort,—that it is you who should be convicted of it.

And if this act, if this spectacle is of a nature to make a profound and painful impression, a deplorable one for morality in general, what impression do you not suppose it will make upon the particular morality of the agents of government? There is a comparison which appeared singularly striking to me, as soon as I became acquainted with the facts.

Three years ago, a functionary of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, a high functionary, differed in political opinion from the Minister upon one point. He did not express his dissent in an obtrusive manner, but he silently voted. The Minister of Foreign Affairs declared that it was impossible for him to live in the official company of a man who did not think precisely as he did; he dismisses him, or, to speak plainly, he expels him from office.

And now, behold another agent, placed not so high in the scale, but nearer to the person of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, commits the acts which you know of. At first, the Minister of Foreign Affairs did not deny that he was acquainted with them; he has since denied it; I admit for a moment that he was ignorant of them. But if he can deny any knowledge of these facts when they occurred, at least he cannot deny that they did take place, and that he now knows them; they are certain. Here there is no longer question concerning a difference of political opinion between you and this agent; the question relates to a moral disagreement, to what most intimately concerns the heart and conscience of man; it is not only the Minister who is here compromised, observe it well, it is the man. You, who have not been able to allow a difference of politi-