

powerful Company as his rival, while Sir John with the perseverance for which he is famous, seeing difficulties but knowing he had made no agreement to give the contract to any one, and that he had the game in his own hands as he had done from the inception of the road, stood with this policy on his head, and Sir Hugh and Mr. Abbott went to Toronto to endeavour to effect the amalgamation of the two companies, which would enable Sir John to carry out the policy authorized by the Act of Parliament. And I am astonished that any intelligent man should not see the mere efforts for amalgamation belie the whole story on which the attack is made. Sir Hugh Allan never got the charter. He never got the contract. I see gentlemen opposite smiling, but I will undertake to say that every intelligent man will endorse the statement that, in the sense used in the resolution, Sir Hugh Allan never got the contract.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS

The **SPEAKER** took the chair at 7.30 o'clock p.m.

* * *

PROVENCHER ELECTION

The **SPEAKER** intimated that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery had received the return for the election of Louis Riel, Esq., as member of Parliament for the district of Provencher in the room of the late Sir George-É. Cartier, deceased. (*Hear, hear.*)

* * *

ELECTION COMMITTEE

Mr. **CHISHOLM** presented the report of the Election Committee for the North Riding of Huron, to the effect that in consequence of the absence of Mr. Joly, chairman, and Mr. Flesher, one of the members of the Committee, they were under the necessity of adjourning for another day.

* * *

THE ADDRESS

The debate on the Address was then resumed.

Hon. Mr. **McDONALD** (**Pictou**) would again refer to the second clause of the charge, in which it was stated that the Government were aware of the negotiations between Sir Hugh and the gentlemen associated with him, with reference to the construction of the Pacific Railway, and which was the ground of impeachment against the Premier and his associates. He had directed the House to the evidence on which it was claimed by the assailants of the Government that that charge was proved, and he

begged to reiterate that the only evidence on which these assailants pretended to establish that serious charge was a declaration of irresponsible persons unworthy of belief, or the unfair inference drawn from facts which were explained in evidence under oath. It might be said, and with truth, that not only had Sir Hugh Allan said to his American friends there was likely to be a Canadian Pacific Railway built, and that it was desirable to have all the capital possible in the undertaking.

But that was not the charge. The charge was that the Government had knowledge of these negotiations, which if carried on, would be detrimental to the best interests of Canada. Sir Hugh had said that the Government had not announced their views on the Canadian Pacific policy. It might be said that there were negotiations going on between Sir Hugh and the Americans. Sir Hugh had said to them, "I will give you so much stock and you will give me in return its value in dividends," but it must be recollected that that was never known to the Administration at all. It was not pretended that there was any proof of any agreement between the Government and Sir Hugh, except the agreement by the telegram of Sir John on the 26th of July—a fair agreement, and authorized by the law of the land and by the Acts of this House.

But the corrupt agreement was not known to the Government. Referring to page 130 of the report of the Commission, Sir Hugh said in his evidence, "that, accordingly, after a certain amount of negotiation, I visited Ottawa in company with some of these gentlemen, and we had an interview with the Government referred to by Sir John, on or about the 5th October, 1871. Sir John's account of that interview, accords perfectly with my recollection of what took place", and Sir Hugh then walked out. And this was the man that, according to the assailants had bought the Government.

Sir Hugh continues—"On the 23rd December, 1871, I entered into an agreement with certain American capitalists. I now produce a copy of that agreement, omitting only the names of the other signers, which I conceive I have no right unnecessarily to drag before the public. The witness here reads the agreement, a copy of which is produced and filed, marked 'P'. There was also a supplementary contract made at a future day." Now, he (Hon. Mr. McDonald) took it for granted that would cover every contract which Sir Hugh had made until the day of Sir John's telegram. Again the evidence continued—"I had no recollection of this contract until within the last few days, and, if I had been asked, would have said I have never seen it. There is no question but that the contract was entered into and that I was one of the signers. Witness here reads the supplementary contract, a copy of which is produced and filed, marked 'Q'. Neither the Government, as a whole, or any member of the Government, ever saw that agreement or had any knowledge of its existence as far as I know, until very recently."

There was the agreement and the only agreement, except the agreement referred to and confirmed by Sir John's telegram. Where was there anything to contradict that? Sir Hugh in his own letter

declared the fact that he had entered into an arrangement confirmed by Sir John's telegram. Where was there anything to contradict that?

Sir Hugh in his own letter declared the fact that he had entered into an arrangement with the Americans, and if he could manage to obtain the necessary legislation, the agreement would come into force; but what did he write later on? Sir Hugh was not the man to say to the Government, "it is true you have deceived me," and then not to bring the charge against them, but not only does he decline to accuse the Premier of corrupt proceedings, but he comes voluntarily into Court and bears testimony that the charge was false. That was the man who, having embarked American capitalists in the negotiations, quietly wipes them out without hesitation. Why would Sir Hugh have done that if he were not convinced that this contract was a fair and a just one? It must be recollected that if one letter of Sir Hugh was sufficient to convict, another was sufficient to acquit.

On the 24th of October, 1872, long after the elections and long after Sir Hugh had paid out these large sums of money, and when this alleged agreement had been made, Sir Hugh knew that he had Sir John in the palm of his hand, he said in writing to Mr. McMullen:—"No action has yet been taken by the Government, in the matter of the Pacific Railroad." Here was the man who, although he had bought the Government, did not know what the action of the Government was. The simple fact was that Sir Hugh was anxious for the just promotion of a great public work—a public work which Sir Hugh would have carried on had it not been for the conduct of the gentleman opposite. He believed that thousands of people would be now seen stretching that great highway across the country if gentleman opposite had not sacrificed the interests of the Dominion to their own greed for power. (*Applause.*)

Sir Hugh continues: "It is still uncertain how it will be given, but in any case the Government seem inclined to exact a declaration that no foreigners shall have directly or indirectly any interest in it." Sir Hugh did not say the Government had deceived him, but he said the Government who have the control of the contract declared to him openly that all foreigners would be excluded. On the 11th November following he wrote this "Dear Mr. McMullen, You really know as much about the Pacific Railroad contract as I do, and that is not much. I am assured that the Government have resolved to form a new Company. It is said that the matter will be arranged by the end of this month." There was a letter from the man who if the charge were true might walk into the office of Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald or into the office of Hon. Sir Francis Hincks, or that of Hon. Mr. Langevin, not as a suppliant for a great contract but to demand such contract.

Sir Hugh said in his letter he recognized the entire control, the entire command which the Government had over this railway. The next clause was that subsequently an understanding was come to with the Government. This was not true.

(*Cries of oh, no, from the Opposition.*)

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Pictou): The hon. gentleman says oh, no. He took the liberty of saying that that was not true. Where was the evidence that Sir Hugh Allan's friends advanced any money? Where was evidence that Sir Hugh Allan had any friends that knew anything of it? He should presently adopt the broad and general view of these resolutions and see if there was any more evidence to sustain it as a whole than in its constituent parts, but now if they were to have technicalities he asked where was the evidence that Sir Hugh Allan had any friends whom he consulted? Did he not swear that he paid every dollar out of his own pocket, and that his brother did not know anything of it until he saw it in the newspapers? Was that not to be believed?

He was not going to follow the example of the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) and argue from strict technicalities what was the charge. In effect it was that an understanding was come to with Sir Hugh to advance a large sum of money and that he should get the charter. That was not founded a fact. There was no evidence on which to base a declaration that Sir Hugh was going to get any charter at that time, or until the time at which the charter was given to the combined company. The Canada Pacific Railroad was incorporated. He had the charter for that road in his pocket, as Mr. Macpherson had the charter of the other company.

The view placed before the House by the hon. gentleman opposite was as unfair, as uncertain, as incorrect, and as loose as the charge upon which it was based. If the charge meant anything at all it meant that on the 30th of July, 1872, there was a corrupt understanding come to, by which Sir Hugh Allan was to get the charter that he then had not, and that he was to give the money which was to carry the elections.

He appealed to the House and to the country to say whether there was a particle of evidence to sustain that. He deprecated, as he had always done, the most unfair mode of reasoning by inferences. He wondered whether, in the case of any criminal that went into the dock, the most petty thief charged with petty larceny, any Englishman of common honour and decency would convict a boy of stealing a handkerchief on mere inferences such as these. Where was there a connected chain of circumstantial evidence? Here they were asked to infer, not only from the patent feature of the evidence, but against the declared oath of the party whose statements they had to adopt.

Sir Hugh Allan and Mr. Abbott were the only two persons living, who were present and knew of that transaction. Mr. Abbott was present. He was a member of the House, and in his clear and positive statement before the Commissioners he had denied the charge, and he had no doubt that he would address the House on this subject. In the meantime they had his evidence and Sir Hugh Allan's evidence, the testimony of the only two people who knew the facts, and he wanted to know if they were going to admit any inferences against the positive evidence of these two men. They might leave out Sir Hugh Allan and take Mr. Abbott alone, than whom there was not a man in the Dominion of higher honour and

greater integrity. (*Cheers.*) There was not a man on the Opposition side of the House even would impeach the true honour and the perfect integrity of that honourable member. (*Cheers.*) They had his oath declaring that the charge of the member for Shefford was devoid of truth; that there was not the slightest foundation for the declaration. They had his oath sustained by Sir Hugh Allan's that no bargain was made or contemplated; that no contract whatever was entered into, but that Sir Hugh Allan, as a member of the Party, gave a large contribution to the elections.

They came now to another unfair argument. It was said that Sir Hugh Allan had given more to the elections in 1872 than he had ever given before, and that he had not been in the habit of giving a large sum of money. What had they to do with the motives which impelled the action of Sir Hugh Allan? Were his motives corrupt? If so, let them prove it. Unless the corrupt motive and the corrupt action were proved it was only an impertinence to ask wherefore Sir Hugh had contributed a larger amount than usual. But the answer was given by himself, and unless this was some more perjury it must be accepted by the House and the country.

Sir Hugh Allan said "it was not for the Pacific road alone that I gave this money, because that was only subordinate to the other problems which I had long fostered in connection with Lower Canada." There was a road between Montreal and Toronto, another west to connect with the Great Western track, a road which the hon. member for Cumberland (Hon. Mr. Tupper) declared that Sir Hugh Allan was largely interested in. Consequent on his ships sailing from the port of Montreal there were interests which he said himself induced him to spend so large a sum of money, and it was doubtful now whether if only the Pacific road had been at issue Sir Hugh would have given a dollar for any privileges he expected to receive. If he had given three hundred thousand dollars for a contract which he did not get, which he knew Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald had no intention of giving him, and which it was in the nature of things that this Parliament would give him, he was not the astute, shrewd merchant hon. gentlemen opposite made him out to be; and it was not likely, if this were true, that he would come into court and declare the charge to be a foul slander.

There was no doubt that Sir Hugh Allan gave one hundred and sixty-two thousand dollars for the elections in the two Provinces of Canada, \$45,000 of which went to Ontario and the balance to the lower Province. That is assumed to be corrupt, but if on the face of the evidence every man who knew about this transaction, the independent, intelligent people of the Dominion of Canada would be struck down who on other grounds deserved well at their hands. If the public spirit of this Dominion should calmly and on reflection see the first men of the State struck down by an inference as false and unfair as it was foul, then he, for one, would be disappointed in the manhood of his country. He did not believe that men were accustomed to deal fairly with their neighbours; men who would readily see that the poorest beggar who walked the street had fair play, would see the first men struck down by evidence so unsustainable and so false in its deductions as that which hon. gentlemen opposite brought forward.

The next paragraph of the charge was as follows:—"That part of the money expended by Sir Hugh Allan in connection with the obtaining of the Act of Incorporation and charter were paid to him by the United States capitalists, under the agreement with him." Where was the evidence of that? (*Cries of oh! oh! from the Opposition.*) He would not suppress any evidence, and he would not follow the example of the other side by perverting the evidence. (*Cheers.*)

What Act of Incorporation and charter was that referred to? Was it the one Sir Hugh Allan got? Did not the hon. gentleman know that that paragraph was intended to convey, and did convey a false impression. The only Act of Incorporation Sir Hugh Allan ever got was that of the Canada Pacific Company. Was that the charter in connection with which he brought the charge of corruption, and in relation to which he alleged a corrupt contract was entered into between the Government and Sir Hugh Allan? He would undertake to say that it was not. The only amount advanced by the Americans was that for the expenses of obtaining the Canada Pacific charter, and the charter of a loan company or something of that kind. The hon. gentleman was so well informed that he alleged that the \$40,000 had been returned by Sir Hugh Allan the moment the contract was made. (*Opposition cries of no, no.*) A gentleman so well versed in the means of obtaining information—(*cheers*)—might have obtained the knowledge of that which Sir Hugh Allan declared on his oath to be the fact.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: He does not say he paid it back before I made my charges.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Pictou): He was not going to give evidence. The hon. gentleman had yesterday undertaken on the floor of the House to give evidence contradictory to that of Judge Coursol.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON said his statement was explanatory, not contradictory.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said that at all events the hon. gentleman had explained Mr. Coursol's evidence under oath on the floor of this House. It would have been better had he given his explanation when Judge Coursol was present. (*Cheers.*) He assumed that Sir Hugh Allan repaid the money when the negotiations with his associates were broken off, several months before the hon. gentleman made his charges on the floor of this House. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would do him the favour to tell him what charter he meant by the Act of incorporation, the expenses of which were paid by the American associates of Sir Hugh Allan?

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON said the charter was obtained in the session of 1872, and according to the evidence the expenses were paid by the associates of Sir Hugh Allan. Long afterwards by the men who furnished the money to Sir Hugh Allan the expenses of the charter were repudiated, and they made arrangements with him (Hon. Mr. Huntington) to bring the charges against the Government. (*Hear, hear and laughter.*)

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said the hon. gentleman spoke of the charter obtained by Sir Hugh Allan in 1872. The records of the country showed that the only charter obtained by Sir Hugh Allan in 1872 was that for the Canada Pacific road, so that the hon. gentleman most unfairly charged as part of the corrupt contract made by the Government, that the associates of Sir Hugh Allan paid some of the expenses of a charter which was obtained with the consent of the hon. gentleman himself in this Parliament. (*Cheers.*)

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: I was not here at the time.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said the charter was obtained by the assent of Parliament. The hon. gentleman was a member of Parliament, and he had therefore a right to assume that he was here. That charge was of a piece with the rest. The construction put upon it by the hon. gentleman was far more fair and tangible than that which they had been considering now. The hon. gentleman had declared that the gist of the charge was that Sir Hugh Allan had purchased the contract, and paid for it with the gold by which the elections were won.

He did not hesitate to put before the people of this country the evidence and the facts which had been elicited; and as he believed his countrymen to be honest and upright, as he believed them to be ready, irrespective of Party prejudice or strife, to do justice to their political opponents, so he believed that the almost universal voice of the people of this country when they were properly informed, would be a verdict, not only of acquittal, but of triumphant honour to the right hon. the leader of the Government (*cheers*), and of condign punishment to the men who would have the hardihood, in the face of the people, to support the resolution of the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington). (*Loud cheers.*)

He did not intend at that late hour to enter into a discussion on the question of prorogation (*cries of "go on"*), because it had been intimated that the House would have another opportunity to discuss that matter, apart from the general question of the evidence. He thought it was desirable that these questions should be separated, but he would refer to an admission in the speech of the leader of the Opposition, which was conclusive against the whole policy of his Party. They had heard, not only that the Ministers who gave the advice, but the high personage who acted on that advice, had been guilty of a violation of the constitution, and of a wrong for which they deserved the censure of the House. The answer was that the Government prorogued because the honour of the Crown was staked upon it, the First Minister having declared, with the assent of the Crown, that the House would only meet *pro forma*, and that no business would be done. (*Cheers.*)

He had not been present himself, but he had read the debates in both the great leading papers of this country, and he knew that before he left Ottawa, that was the declaration he heard fall from the lips of the Minister. That was the statement made by the First Minister, but it had been denied by gentlemen on the other side. He would refer again to the letter sent to his Excellency the Governor

General on the 23rd July, 1873, by the hon. member for Shefford, in which, sending him the letters published by his people, he said: "I send you evidence of corruption on the part of your Ministers which, whatever the understanding when the House adjourned must compel you now to make the re-assembling of the House on the 13th of August a regular session."(*Cheers.*)

He would prove by this letter that when it was written the hon. gentleman had no more idea that the House was to be called together for business than he (Hon. Mr. McDonald) had. (*Cheers.*) Why was it necessary for him, as a member of this House, to go out of his way in unauthorizedly tendering to his Excellency a paper deeply affecting the honour of his advisers, and asking his Excellency to come to a premature decision, in the absence of the men who were charged. It was bad enough to publish these letters, to let them go into the press without the sanction of any responsible person, but to ask the hon. gentleman to take cognizance of the papers, because the hon. gentleman and his friends could not wait for the proper time of the assembling of Parliament, giving as a reason that although it was well known that the reassembling of Parliament in August 13th would be *pro forma*—

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: No, no. (*Cries of "yes, yes."*)

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON here rose.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Pictou): I am not to be interrupted.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD called the member for Shefford to order, saying that he had no right to rise.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON said he rose for the purpose of going to his desk, to give a copy of the letter desired by the hon. member for Pictou. (*There were great cheers and laughter at this announcement, and the scene was enlivened by the fact that when Hon. Mr. Huntington went to his desk he found that he had not the key, and had to go and find it before he could comply with the hon. member's request.*)

Hon. Mr. BLAKE: The hon. gentleman has mistaken the letter.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Pictou): Then it is the hon. gentleman's fault. He read it, and it ought to have been laid on the table and made the property of the House, and then I could not have mistaken the purport of it.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: I have tried a number of keys with which to open the desk. (*Cries of "Stolen!" "Order!" and laughter.*)

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) proceeded to say that the hon. member for Shefford had expressed his desire to know the temper in which Parliament was to deal with this question. There was no man in this House or in the country who was more anxious to ascertain that than he was himself. He had a perfect reliance on the honour of this House, and believed that a majority of the

representatives of the people of the Dominion would deal fairly with this question, which was one not only of a political character of great importance, but involving what was of far more importance, the honour of every public man.

The hon. gentleman then read the letter in question, and continuing, said that he thought the House would see that the only construction of this letter was that he had put upon it. (*Cheers and Opposition laughter.*) No, he was saying he quite concurred with the expression made by the hon. member for Shefford, any he sympathized with him in his declaration that it was unsafe to have thieves around—(*laughter*)—now it was, to say the least of it, very curious. This was a very curious expression to come from an hon. member on that side of the House. The hon. member, in speaking of an hon. Minister of the Crown, or in allusion to the subject which he was discussing, referred to the danger of having thieves around. He (Hon. Mr. McDonald) must say that at any rate it was curious that such an expression should have come from that side of the House, and he was quite sure that the country generally would agree with him that such an expression found its rest at home.

He would like to ask what the temper of Parliament was to be on entering upon the discussion of this question. Were they to enter upon it in the temper exhibited here tonight? He believed that would be found to be a true index of it. The hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) had spoken for two or three hours last night, and during that time he did not think that he was interrupted on one occasion, except when his eloquence was applauded. He congratulated hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that they had not been carried away by their feelings, but had listened attentively, in order that they might come to a determination in accordance with the truth as they believed it. The hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie), the leader of the Opposition, assumed last night that he calculated on obtaining a majority composed, in a measure, of members from this side of the House. He (Hon. Mr. McDonald) could only tell the hon. gentleman that he had no authority for making such a declaration.

He knew that the honour of the right hon. the Premier was safe in the hands of this House, and could only tell the hon. gentleman that if they should by a catch vote succeed in driving his right hon. friend from power, and casting upon him a stain which they had so ardently endeavoured to do, history would very shortly do him justice, and that in the hearts of the people of this country his history and his name would be kept sacred as that of which they might well be proud.

The hon. gentleman then put the following resolution in the Speaker's hands:—"And we desire to assure His Excellency that after consideration of the statements made in the evidence before us, and while we regret the outlay of money by all political parties at Parliamentary elections, and desire the most stringent measures to put an end to the practice, we at the same time beg leave to express our continued confidence in His Excellency's advisers, and in the administration of public affairs." (*Government cheers.*)

Mr. GLASS: I rise not so much to answer the remarks made by the hon. member for Pictou, or those of any other hon. gentleman, as to place a statement before the House, which will clearly define my own position. I will, however, before taking my seat, prove that the hon. member for Pictou, placed on record a resolution to the effect that we should come to the House on the 13th of August, for the despatch of business. With regard to that part of the hon. gentleman's speech, which materially affects, and which relates to the course I have thought proper to pursue, I feel it my duty to make such comments as will put me right with the House and the country.

I desire to make known the sequence of reasons which induced me to take the course I pursued on the 13th of August, and also point out what I believe the duty of the hour. And if a number of gentlemen in this House and out of it have expressed great personal attachment to me, and particularly because I came to the city of Ottawa last week (*hear, hear, and laughter*), I trust that these hon. gentlemen and other friends of my own are sincere, as their earnest professions would lead one to believe. I trust that behind their placid exterior I may not find an iron hand, and that these expressions of friendship are not mere mockery. A course may be pursued by me that will put these friendships to the test, and if the test fails to secure the friendship then, Mr. Speaker, it would prove that they were as hollow and short-lived as their pretensions. But, Sir, I will not anticipate that. I shall try, both privately and publicly, to so deport myself before this House and the country as will entitle me to the respect even of those who are opposed to me in opinion. (*Applause.*)

When this question was brought before the House, Mr. Speaker, on the 2nd of April last, by the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington), it was intimated that there was no foundation in fact for making the charge, and that those who were faithful to the Ministers were to regard the charges as an expression of want of confidence, and vote them down. This was done with fidelity not soon to be forgotten in this House, and with an earnestness which showed how sincerely the followers of the Administration had confidence in their leaders.

On the 8th of the same month of April, the Right Hon. the First Minister (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) made a resolution, and caused it to be carried, for the appointing of five hon. gentlemen and members of this House a Committee for the investigation of the charges: That committee was selected with the view, as far as possible, to have the relative strength of the parties of this House fairly represented upon it. The House, by this act, declared deliberately the result of its judgment was, that the Committee should not be composed wholly of those who were pre-disposed for or against the accused, but that it should be composed so as to give an opportunity for the eliciting of every portion of the evidence, and prevent any wrong being done. That Committee was the off-spring of the House; created for and concerning a matter brought before the House, a matter not brought before any other tribunal, authority, or court, and therefore, Sir, in my judgment—and I give it with all deference to those of greater experience—according to my judgment, cognizable of this House and this House alone. The

Government was so strong in numbers upon that Committee that it should have had no hesitation in allowing it to proceed vigorously with its labours. (*Applause.*)

The charges were of such a nature as to implicate every hon. gentleman sitting on this side of the House. This constituted a greater reason for promptness in the rendition of the evidence in order that no time might be lost in order that the members and supporters might be completely vindicated. This was not a matter, as has been said, that affects individual members alone. It is a matter which is material to the Dominion of Canada, therefore, when these charges were brought in this House they created a sensation in every city, town, and hamlet throughout the whole Dominion. A sensation, Sir, which partook not of excitement but of solemn wonder—wonder at the enormity of the charges, and solemn because of the consequences which must follow if these charges could in any degree be sustained by evidence. (*Hear, hear.*) Those who were wont to believe ill of the Government readily fell into the belief that the charges were true, while the supporters of the Administration as stoutly denied the truthfulness of these charges, and with this view and to this end every resolution brought before this House was carried strongly in favour of the Government in order that the Ministers themselves and their supporters might be vindicated, and that it might be clearly shown that the spirit of fair dealing and generosity towards the accused rested as surely in the British heart here as in any other part of the Empire. (*Hear, hear.*)

The charges were of a grave nature and therefore the greater necessity some time should be given to prepare for the defence. That time was given, not grudgingly but heartily, in order that the Ministers might have an opportunity of justifying themselves and their supporters. (*Hear, hear, and applause.*) During the time the matter was under discussion in this House, the right hon. first Minister frequently suggested that he would have no objection to the appointment of a Royal Commission. That suggestion was not seconded by any member of this House, and therefore the fair presumption was that the Royal Commission was not desired by the House for the most obvious cause, that the Commissioners would owe their legal life and management to the persons who were accused. (*Hear, hear.*) It would appear to be contrary to the fundamental principles of natural justice. (*Loud applause.*) No one pretended to deny the supremacy of this House, supreme above the Government, and in the mother country supreme above the Throne itself, which more than half a score of times since the days of William the Norman had been regulated, controlled, and settled by their Commons House of England. I was of opinion that when this question was brought before this House, the prototype of the greatest deliberative assembly in the world, that this House, whether by direct resolution or by tacit consent, should not be superseded, disregarded, or set aside, as that course would create an evil precedent, dangerous to the liberties of the people and the future prospects of the country. (*Hear, hear, and loud applause.*)

I say when that question was under consideration in the House the right hon. first Minister suggested on more than one occasion that he would have no objection to the appointment of a Royal

Commission; but that suggestion was not adopted for the reasons I have referred to.

Prior to the adjournment it was stated on the floor of the House that the House would be adjourned until a future day in August, and that on that day the House would meet as a matter of form and be prorogued, and that it would not be necessary for hon. gentlemen to be present, only the Speakers of the two Houses, in order that the report of the Committee might be received.

That I believe was an error, and contrary to British Parliamentary rules. The report could not have been received without a quorum of members being present. A quorum of members would constitute a House; being a House it would be master of its own acts, and being master of its own acts, it would not be likely to be prorogued without its own consent, saving the right of the prerogative, which should have been used with great care, it being a relic of the age of prerogative, which had now passed away. It will not be seriously pretended that the statement of the right hon. the Premier of this House (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) was in itself to be declared as the final action of the Commons of Canada. If it were pretended that by that statement the minds of the Crown, the thirteen Ministers—then Ministers—the Senate Chamber and the House of Commons, would have been locked up, their tongues paralysed and their hands tied; if it is pretended that all persons in authority would have been wholly powerless for acting on the 13th of August, it was a forced and unjust interpretation, and never, in my judgment, was intended by the first Minister to be carried out literally at the time it was made.

My own view of it was that in all human probability we would not proceed to discharge business on the 13th August, but that we were not precluded from doing so if necessity required. There is only one state of facts that would have justified a literal carrying out of that statement, and that was if the Committee, after hearing the evidence, and after a full deliberation, had come into the House and reported that the charges against the Ministers were wholly without foundation. In fact this may have been what the right hon. Minister had in his mind when he made the statement; but for a moment look at the converse of this case. Suppose the Committee, after a full hearing of the evidence and deliberation thereupon, came to the conclusion, however reluctantly, that they were compelled to report the condemnation of the Government, and that the charges against the Ministers had been established, will it be pretended that Ministers themselves, under these circumstances, would have desired to remain in office till the following year? (*Hear, hear and loud applause.*)

That members should have been sent permanently away from the capital to their homes, and there with their constituents to brood over the conspicuous feebleness of the condition, to have heaved upon society a glaring, flagrant wrong, a wrong against the dignity of the Crown, a wrong against the other two branches of the Legislature, a wicked, violent wrong against the great mass of her Majesty's liege subjects in this Dominion, a deep and wanton injustice against every State in the realm.

But it is contended that in an exigency of that nature, some executive authority would have interfered to prevent so great an injustice. I will believe it, Sir, I believe that on that very 13th day of August, that the House would have been consulted, would have been invoked and its healthful opinions acted upon; but, Sir, the whole press and the country were of the same opinion, that the 13th of August was a time at which such difficulties as the miscarriage of the Oaths Bill and other matters of that nature might be disposed of. I contend, Sir, that the disallowance of that Oaths Bill was as important in its nature as the condemnation or acquittal of Ministers would have been, and, therefore, in that difficulty the Government should have consulted this House. (*Cheers.*) When that disallowance took place, Ministers ought to have seen to it that abundance of time was given to each member to prepare for the meeting of this House on the 13th, and takes such steps as would have prevented the unseemly difficulty of that memorable day. (*Cheers.*)

Was it to be wondered at, Mr. Speaker, that on the 13th of August these fourteen men who had formerly acted in accordance with the Government of the country availed themselves of the opportunity then offered to memorialize His Excellency, praying His Excellency not to allow that day to pass without giving an opportunity to this House to purge itself of the charge made against it, and to throw off that cloud, which like a heavy pall was resting upon it, for it was not Ministers alone who were included in the charge, but also this House of Commons, a majority of whose members were personally implicated. (*Hear, hear.*) These fourteen gentlemen, in so far as I know, had never shown themselves carping needy politicians, but steadfastly supported the Government. On the contrary, votes which were perhaps in some respects objectionable to them, but were regarded as of a character sufficient to force them to be cast against the Government, were reported in favour of the measures of the Administration. They were as loyal to the Administration as any of their followers and, let me ask, during the whole session of Parliament of last spring, could there be found in any country a Government which was sustained by more devoted, more loyal, more attached followers than these same fourteen. I say, Sir, they could not (*hear, hear*). Never during that last session of Parliament did I record a single vote against their wishes, and during the years that I had consistently, unflinchingly and regularly supported the coalition Government of that period and candidates of the party, I never either asked for or received a single personal favour at their hands.

It will, therefore, be clear to those who hear me that I have had no quarrel with the Administration, because of any favour they have in their power to grant. (*Hear, hear.*) I say that to those men who claimed to exercise an independent judgment upon that day, a portion of the press of this country has done a deep injustice, when they charge them with having some personal purpose to serve; and the hon. member for Vancouver (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks), who told all upon the floor of this House that these men had all been allotted to one place and another, also did them a

gross injustice by the statement—a statement which their previous conduct neither warranted nor excused. (*Cheers.*)

I have now to challenge Ministers and every follower they have, and the Leaders of the Opposition and every follower they have, to point out, if they can, a single incident that would warrant them in saying that I have been moved to my present action by any favours they can either give or withhold. (*Loud cheers.*) I felt sure, Sir, that all the gentlemen who acted with me on the 13th of August did so from equally disinterested motives.

In regard to the press I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in adverting to it at all, I am treading on most dangerous grounds, but I must say something with regard to the press, nevertheless, when free, and enlightened, the press is a power in our midst, and a safeguard of civil liberty. It has acceded to it, in this country, a reasonable and unreasonable liberty, and there has been acceded to it the character for honesty of purpose. I say that the press ought to extend to hon. members of the House the character for honesty of purpose, unless they can point out that that judgment is distorted from selfish motives and for selfish purposes. (*Hear, hear.*) Some of the leading journals have acted fairly upon this principle, but a great many of the Ministerial papers in Ontario have, on the contrary, behaved most unfairly towards those who on that occasion thought proper to exercise an independent judgment. They have done so, if not by writing and publishing editorials of their own, at least by reproducing articles from Opposition journals, written in the heat of the election contest of 1872, as if these could have any weight upon the issue now before the country.

I have myself been held up to the ridicule, and the scorn and the contempt of my constituents, and for what cause? Simply because I thought proper on the 13th of August, not to insult any person in authority, nor to pronounce any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the accused Ministers, but in a respectful memorial to ask and pray His Excellency the Governor General not to allow that day to pass without giving this House an opportunity of clearing itself from the charges made against it. (*Cheers.*) I believe that in the exercise of the privilege which we took advantage of on that day, namely, to memorialize the Governor General, we did no more than, as the people's representatives, we had a perfect right to do, and that the opinion of the public press should characterize us as deceivers, betrayers of confidence, paltry fools, was surely most unjust. These journals, while pretending to act in the interest of the Government, have done the very contrary; but they have not acted merely contrary to the interests of the Government, but contrary to the interests of common sense and common justice. (*Loud cheers.*)

Sir, I see by the message of His Excellency the Governor General that he gives publicity in an official document to a letter from the hon. member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Palmer). (*Hear, hear.*) From that despatch I see that we were unable to proceed on the 13th of August because the hon. member

for the city and county of St. John could not be here (*laughter and cheers*), and therefore, Mr. Speaker, the business of this country must stop. (*Great cheering.*)

This was a little awkward for the country, Sir, but no matter; the hon. gentleman had put his foot down, and when he did that it was not to be despised, even physically (*great laughter*), but very much more to be regarded when looked upon morally and politically (*laughter and cheers*), but the hon. gentleman was not content with absenting himself from the House; he must also write a letter, which afterwards became public property, showing his reasons for this deadlock in public affairs. (*Laughter.*) The country will be surprised to learn that when the questions were under consideration on the 23rd of May, the hon. member was not here at all and had not been for several days previously. (*Cheers.*) I may say that some time prior to that discussion he was away from the city, and this Province, and when that matter was under consideration, very likely his stately form might have been seen leaving itself in the Bay of Fundy—(*great laughter and cheers*)—or, perhaps, the hon. gentleman was then engaged in thinking over some great matter of State, or dwelling upon the question of how the great tide might ultimately affect the Baie Verte Canal. (*Laughter and cheers.*)

However that may be, I state of my own personal knowledge, and I was not absent for one hour from this city during the whole length of the session, that the hon. gentleman was not in his place for several days before the discussion in question (*cheers*), but if it were true, Sir, that this House adjourned in May upon the express understanding or agreement that it was to meet in August merely as a matter of form, and be prorogued—then Sir, if that were true, which I am prepared to prove it is not, and that out of the mouths of Ministerial supporters, circumstances had arisen in the interval which imperatively demanded that the House should have assembled for the transaction of business on the 13th of August.

Sir, I have said that I could prove from the mouths of gentlemen upon this side of the House that such was not the understanding, and one gentleman who I see very much amazed at my statement, the hon. member for Lévis (Hon. Mr. Blanchet) is that person. (*Cheers.*) I ask him whether he had not stated publicly, and placed it upon record, that we should meet here on the 13th of August for the discharge of business.

Hon. Mr. BLANCHET: No.

Mr. GLASS: If it were true, Sir, that we adjourned in May for the purpose of meeting, as a matter of form, in August, considering the disallowance of the Oaths Bill, considering the gravity of the charges, and considering the number of persons implicated, it was the duty of ministers before that 13th day of August to have made such preparation for the occasion as not to allow it to pass without giving this House the opportunity of disposing of the several matters. (*Cheers.*) It has been said that the House had no power to swear witnesses or to administer an oath to them in any way, and that we were not entitled to consider the matter of the Committee at

all. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that to be true. (*Cheers.*) I believe that means could have been adopted whereby the oath could be administered. Whether it could or could not, however, is a matter which no power outside this House had a right to speak to, and any interference with the rights or privileges of this House should be deprecated by all, but by none more severely than the sworn Ministers of the Crown, the pledged protectors of the great rights of the people. (*Great cheers.*)

But those who thought proper to sign that memorial on the 13th of August were charged with violating an agreement whereby we adjourned in May to meet in August. As a matter of fact, I was here, Sir, during the whole of the time, and, in my judgment, no such agreement was arrived at. (*Hear, hear.*) I heard the statement of the right hon. the First Minister (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald)—that was merely a statement, and the same authority by which it was made could as readily have made a counter statement. No one person can make an agreement; it requires at least two consenting parties to an agreement. But leaving that out of the question, the exigencies of this matter demanded that the House should meet upon that day for the despatch of business. None of the hon. gentlemen upon the opposite side of the House believed that we were to meet upon that day except for the discharge of business, if the House so willed it, nor yet, for that matter, upon this side of the House. (*Cries of "Yes, yes," and "No, no".*)

I contend, Sir that the hon. member for Lévis (Hon. Mr. Blanchet) and the hon. member for Pictou (Hon. Mr. McDonald) and the hon. member for Cardwell (Hon. Mr. Cameron) voted that the Committee should adjourn until the 13th of August in order to get instruction from this House. I take the following report of the proceedings in that connection from a newspaper:—"Mr. McDonald said he had an amendment to make to the motion of Hon. Mr. Dorion. He moved, 'That whereas the Act passed last session of Parliament empowering this and other Committees of the House to administer oaths to witnesses, who shall be examined before them, has been disallowed by the Imperial authorities, and whereas this Committee was instructed to examine witnesses before them under oath, therefore, resolved, that in the opinion of this Committee they cannot be examined until further instructed by the House of Commons'."

Now this resolution was put at Montreal, and carried by the hon. member for Cardwell, Pictou, and Lévis. While I have every respect for the talents, subtlety, skill, and legal acumen of the hon. member for Pictou (Hon. Mr. McDonald) I think the latter part of his argument that addressed to those who thought proper to use their own judgment on the 13th August had better have been omitted.

I should not have adverted at all to the hon. gentleman's remarks, as I have no desire to comment on the observations of the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, although I have taken note of their remarks, but I am prepared to fight with such weapons as I am attacked with in this House. It was also the unanimous opinion of the Committee that it would be improper for them to be interfered with by their creation into a Royal Commission. Three leading

members on this side of the House had recognized by their official act that we should come here on the 13th of August for the despatch of business, and I think it is fair to presume that they were not alone in coming to that conclusion, because the hon. member for Cumberland (Hon. Mr. Tupper) said last night, as I understood it, that the Administration was at that time in Montreal. These three gentlemen were appointed to investigate the charges, and see that justice was particularly done to the Administration. I submit, Sir, it was reasonable that if the Administration were there they would have been consulted as to the course to be pursued. The resolution I have read, having been passed by the Committee, while the first Minister and other members of the Government were at Montreal, I say it would not have been a very great stretch of the imagination to suppose it was in accordance with their views.

I believe it was the intention then of all parties to have had a meeting on the 13th of August as their leading journal, the *Montreal Gazette*, and other journals in Ontario and Quebec, gave the 13th of August as the time when the Committee should come back and receive fresh life and vigour, before it should proceed further.

It is quite clear that when the Committee adjourned at Montreal it was upon the express and written agreement that they should come back to this House in August; but, Sir, were the members of the committee present? Was there any member here with his report, or to explain what had been done at their meetings, or to step forward and redeem the pledge made to me, to you, and to this House, that they would be here on that day to give an account of what had been done in the past? No, they were not here, but there were fourteen members of this House, who had formerly acted in accord with them. Because these fourteen members presumed to memorialize His Excellency that the pledge of the Committee, the pledge of the press, the dictates of reason and justice, might be fulfilled, they must be called traitor and other vile names.

In my own constituency, on the 14th of August, they were not at all sparing in their opinions with regard to my presumption in exercising my best judgment. I have informed my constituents that they would not be responsible for any portion of my conduct, and that, while I was proud of representing them in Parliament, I thought still more highly of my own self-respect. (*Applause.*) I also told them I would not sit there beyond the time I could exercise an independent vote.

An hon. member asks me why I don't resign. My answer will be that which it has invariably been since the time I signed the memorial. If it can be shown that my position is such that I ought to resign, I have stated out of the House and I will state here that I shall not shrink from it if I find it is my duty. I have consulted with several gentleman, and stated that I must do what I believed to be my duty or resign my seat. The invariable answer was to exercise my own judgment and account to the electors afterwards. They advised me not to resign. I have shown that the adjournment of the Committee in Montreal was for the purpose of coming back here for this House to exercise its functions on that day.

Up to that time no evidence has been taken or appeared to substantiate the charges made by the hon. member for Shefford, but on the 4th of July, nearly six weeks prior to the 13th of August, strange and startling developments were hurried into public notice. On that day a sheaf of letters, written by Sir Hugh Allan, was given to the press; these letters developed an astounding state of public immorality, the whole country was panic stricken; men looked at each other in silence; Ministerial supporters settled down into an opinion that these letters were false, gotten up for the occasion, but the suspense was not long. On the 5th of July Sir Hugh Allan, over his own signature, under the solemnity of an oath, swore that these letters, with some slight discrepancies, were true. He swore that in the autumn of 1871 he received the names of McMullen and Smith from the then Finance Minister of Canada, Hon. Sir Francis Hincks. He swore that he entered into negotiations with these men for the procuring of the Pacific Railway charter. He stated that he was shown a telegram dated the 26th of July from Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald to Sir George-É. Cartier, in which he (Sir Hugh Allan) was secured in the presidency of the Pacific Railway. He stated that Hon. Sir Francis Hincks had told him that the contract should get let by tender, but that through his great influence, money and power, they were compelled to come to his terms to give him the charter with fifty millions acres in land and thirty millions in gold. He stated to his American friends that they would have to go it blind on the subject of money, and he could get no vouchers at all for money paid out by him. He stated that Mr. McMullen had entered into negotiations to secure the inferior members of the Government, but he discouraged this feeling; that it was only powder and shot thrown away. He stated that as late as the 14th of September 1872, after the elections were all over, he had expended \$343,000, and had \$13,000 more to pay out.

Mr. MORRISON: What did you get?

Mr. GLASS: I did not get one cent. I do not think the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Morrison) could speak quite so certainly on that subject. (*Laughter and applause.*) The hon. gentlemen asks how much I have received. I can tell him that David Glass has never received the value of sixpence from this or any other Government, and he has never been insulted by having bribes offered to him. (*Renewed cheers.*) Can the hon. member for Niagara make a statement of that sort? (*Applause.*) I have no desire to draw the name of the hon. member for Niagara before this House but if hon. gentlemen do think proper to interrupt me by questions and remarks, which may fairly be construed into offence, then they must expect me to reply. (*Loud cheering.*)

On the 5th of July, Mr. Speaker, the affidavit of Sir Hugh Allan was published. From that time till the House was prorogued in August—a space of six weeks—ample opportunity was given for arrangements to be made for the meeting of this House for the despatch of business. In this way the matter stood up to the 18th July, and on the morning of that day George W. McMullen gave to the country a history of what he declared to be the whole of this transaction during its progress and up to its completion.

Before making any remarks in regard to that letter, let me ask who is this George W. McMullen? (*Hear, hear, from Government benches.*) I hear a response in all directions of hear, hear. The hon. member for Niagara is again enlivened on this point. (*Cheers and laughter.*) The question I have referred to is one of the deepest interest to the people of this country. I have not had the honour, Sir, if it be an honour, of even speaking to the gentleman. He has been pointed out to me on the street and from his personal appearance, I should not say he is a very dangerous man. He looks like a thoughtful, hardworking man, and so far as I can judge, I would not take him to be a very great rascal. I notice, however, that the press is greatly divided upon his good qualities.

All that is known of him so far as I have been able to gather from authentic documents is that in the spring of 1871 he was one of a delegation sent from the city of Chicago, to Ottawa, on the subject of the enlargement of canals. The great city of the West, the splendid commercial metropolis of the western States of the Union, with a population of over 250,000, thought proper to delegate this dreadful man to Ottawa on a matter of material benefit to Canada; therefore, coming amongst us at that time and under those circumstances, he was calculated to impress us with respect.

In the same year Hon. Sir Francis Hincks, the then Finance Minister of this Dominion, gave his name, along with others, to Sir Hugh Allan in connection with the Pacific Railway negotiations, and he soon became Sir Hugh's bosom friend. (*Hear, hear.*) He was the representative of one hundred millions of capital in this undertaking, and was surrounded by some of our Knights and honourable men, (*cheers*) petted, flattered, and called endearing names by the great Mogul of Ravenscraig, (*great cheers and laughter*) courted and sought after by the owners of gold, power, and tinselled titles. Who has a right to question that he was the worthy representative of the wealth and knighthood of the two nations? (*Great cheers.*)

Of George W. McMullen I know nothing, except the few historical facts that present themselves in these letters and in this evidence, but I have heard him upon the floor of this House called a liar and a perjurer, a Yankee speculator, a Yankee curb stone broker, one of the Yankee ring, and a great many other similar names.

Can it be that this man's nationality is paraded as a reason for his condemnation? Who has the right to hold cheap the laws of hospitality and even handed justice, because one of the parties concerned chances to hold alliance to a foreign country? I know nothing of the man, I repeat, but after the manner I have heard his name paraded and his honour challenged, I think it my duty, on the floor of the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, to say that we cannot afford to pander to any class, or to parade nationality as a ground for exclusiveness. (*Hear, hear.*) We do not disguise, and do not care to, that hundreds of thousands of our best and most enterprising citizens have, at one time, been resident in, and held allegiance to, the great Republic south of us. (*Loud cheers.*) They, with their enterprise, and capital, are building up manufactures from

one end of the Dominion to the other, and I for one, on the floor of the House, take the opportunity of saying that a man's country shall be no reason for his exclusion from places of trust and responsibility. (*Cheers.*)

I say, Sir, that the title Yankee has been attributed in the case with a view to obtain the man's condemnation; but Sir, to return to the statement which this McMullen gave in the press on the 18th July, a statement which he said he was prepared to prove was true in all respects. Appended to that statement were vouchers of a most important character. (*Hear, hear.*) Appended to that statement, Sir, were vouchers for the ten thousand and twenty thousand, but, Sir, these vouchers were only a supplementary character. They showed themselves that they followed some other large amounts, and the most charitable interpretation possible was that double that amount had been derived for the same purpose from the same source. The most important paragraph in the statements of Mr. George W. McMullen was corroborated by Senator Foster, who also corroborated the fact that the late acting Minister of Militia (Hon. Sir George-É. Cartier) had received \$25,000. Whoever Senator Foster is, the credibility of his testimony is most material to the establishment of this charge or the acquittal of those implicated in it. This we know of him, that he was elected to the old Parliament of Canada in '58, that he was elected to the Legislative Council in 1860; and in 1867, being a Conservative friend of the late Sir George-É. Cartier, he was elevated to the Senate. He is a man of probity and honour, and therefore, Sir, his statement by way of corroboration was material.

I confess, Mr. Speaker, that up to the morning of the 18th of July I was strongly impressed, as I was when they were made in this House, with the un-reliability of these charges; but when I compared that statement with the letters of Sir Hugh Allan, and the affidavit of Sir Hugh Allan, I say, Sir, that upon that morning, however reluctantly, I was forced to the conclusion that a strong *prima facie* case had been established (*cheers*), and Sir, believing that I would have been unworthy and unfit to occupy a seat on the floor of this House, if I were not true enough to myself and those around me to acknowledge the truthfulness of the fact.

Two or three times during the course of my remarks the hon. member for Niagara has interrupted me. I desire not to be personal with the hon. member, or with any hon. member of this House, but I have heard certain whisperings from the hon. gentleman in regard to myself, which I beg to say are without foundation in fact, and not to be indulged in. Something of the same kind had been attempted once or twice before, tonight, and I think it extremely desirable that if any hon. gentleman has anything to say in regard to me, that he stand up on the floor and make his statement, when I shall do my endeavours to answer him. (*Loud cheers.*) I have nothing to fear from that hon. gentleman, or from any other hon. gentleman on this side of this House. I certainly have nothing to fear from hon. gentlemen on the opposite. (*Hear, hear.*) The hon. member for Essex (Hon. Mr. O'Connor) gives one of his most complacent smiles and says "Hear, hear". I do not see that those gentlemen on the opposite side are so very dangerous that hon. gentlemen need

make any comment upon my remarks in regard to them. (*Hear, hear.*)

Sir, I am not aware that in giving this vote in accordance with my judgement, and because my judgement accords with that of hon. gentlemen opposite, there is any reason why they should not make such indications by applause or otherwise as show that we concur. (*Hear, hear.*) If we concur in judgment and they applaud my expression of that judgment, I suppose hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House will also exercise their right to express their disapproval. I am prepared to say that I have nothing to fear as far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned.

Sir, I repeat that on the 18th of July this statement of Mr. McMullen was given to the public. That was nearly four weeks prior to the time when Parliament was to have met, on the 13th of August. These developments which ought to have contributed to the reasons for the meeting of this House for the despatch of business, appear rather to have retarded the meeting of this House than to have hurried forward its assembling. We came here on the 13th of August, not for the purpose of taking advantage of the Government in anything, for I for one, in signing that memorial, desired to disabuse the minds of both the Ministers and the House that there was any understanding or agreement, that any business should be done on that day that would be detrimental to the Administration, but that, if necessary, an adjournment should be had in order to have a full meeting of the House and as full an opportunity for public expression or opinion.

When, Mr. Speaker, the 13th of August came and with it came the peculiar excitement attendant on the uncertain state of affairs on that day, the hon. members of this House thought proper to attach their names to a memorial to His Excellency the Governor General; then, Sir, the whole Ministerial press of the country sounded it loudly throughout this Dominion that we had been guilty of a gross breach of decorum and of the Constitution; but, Mr. Speaker, it was not so, as was acknowledged by the high-minded nobleman himself, who so ably fills the Vice-Regal Chair. That distinguished gentleman did acknowledge their importance. He received the deputation from the memorialists with the consideration due to their importance, and His Excellency regretted deeply that under the peculiar circumstances of the case, it would be utterly impossible for him to comply with the terms of the memorialists. This, I have no doubt, was the opinion given at the moment by His Excellency in regard to that point, but the State paper which followed was not the act of His Excellency, but the act of His Excellency's responsible advisers. I have stated my belief that it was the act of his advisers. The Crown itself had no right to act upon a matter of that sort without being under the advice of the responsible Ministers; and being under the advice of its responsible Ministers, then it is the work of the Ministers who are responsible to this House.

I was one of those who signed the memorial, and I have a right to speak on the subject. It will therefore devolve upon the Government to explain why the judicial functions of this House having been

invoked on the 8th day of April last, by the unanimous voice of the House; why these functions should have been superseded at the mere caprice of the Ministers. With regard to the portion of the reply which directs the memorialists to the fact that the unavoidable result of acceding to their request would have been that the Ministers would have had to retire from office, I maintain that the result was not warranted by the terms of the memorial (*hear, hear*) as an adjournment of the House for a short time would have been a satisfactory answer to the memorialists.

The 13th of August will for all time constitute a singular page in the history of this country, a page never to be repeated. The future would be oppressive to ourselves and our children if scenes like these could be looked forward to. The scene there enacted was a strange one at any time or amongst any people, but peculiarly strange to a young, fresh, vigorous country like the Dominion of Canada. On that day, the session suffered a violent death. In its place rose a new authority, to make room for which the session had been killed. This new authority assumed to inherit the rights and privileges of the dead Parliament, without any bequest having been made in its favour. It is for this undue assumption of power that that authority is placed upon its trial in this House, and all those who are to do so, have an opportunity of bowing themselves down to it, and they have an opportunity of prostrating themselves by giving a vote which strikes, to my judgment, at the very root of free government. (*Hear, hear.*)

I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to detain the House further (*cries of "Go on"*) on this subject, but I wish to say that the Ministers and the persons accused with them are entitled to the benefit of every doubt from their enemies, and even more, if possible, from their friends. By a beneficent provision of British justice all are presumed to be innocent until they are proved to be guilty, and confessions even are not at all times regarded as the highest testimony (*hear, hear*), but when this is coupled with documentary evidence, with confirmatory surrounding circumstances, the case is conclusive. (*Cheers.*) It will be for this House, Sir, to say what is the presumption of innocence. I regret to say that the presumption is removed. If hon. members think similarly, then let all who stand in the pathway of the country's honour be removed rather than that the country's honour should be removed. (*Hear, hear, and continued applause.*)

Mr. Baker and Mr. Palmer both claimed the floor. The Speaker giving his decision,

Mr. BAKER began by saying that it was his opinion that they had listened to the dying declaration of the hon. member for Middlesex East (Mr. Glass). (*Cries of "Oh, oh," and laughter.*) He announced that he was formerly on the best friendly terms with the hon. gentleman, and he promised that he could continue the pleasant relations. He considered that the hon. gentleman had made for himself a new departure, and he had also created a new departure in the department of constitutional law. He would be pardoned if he said that the constitutional law of the hon. gentleman was rather shaky.

He referred to the advice proffered by the hon. gentleman to His Excellency on the 13th of August, and said that it had been declined, but perhaps the hon. gentleman hoped by his change of policy to tender such advice to His Excellency in the future as he would be constitutionally in a position to accept. He paid a high tribute to the Governor General, referring to his speech at Halifax as one which, or a portion of it, should be printed in letters of gold. He defended the letter and abilities of the hon. member for St. John, who, he contended was able to defend himself, and to speak with authority upon any question, constitutional or otherwise, which might arise in this House. He concluded by saying that he had other remarks to make, but certain gentlemen not being present he would not do so.

Mr. YOUNG (Waterloo South) said he had heard the hon. member for Pictou (Hon Mr. McDonald) deliver not a few able addresses in the House, but he never heard anything equal to the speech which he had delivered that day, for incorrect statements and illogical deductions. It seemed as if he had forgotten that he was addressing the Parliament of Canada, and acted on the principle of the attorney:—"No case, abuse the opposite side." (*Hear, hear.*) This subject had assumed a new phase since last session. The Royal Commission, partial, one-sided and farcical, as some of its proceedings were, substantially proved the charges brought forward by the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington). Not only was the evidence sufficient, but they had no justifiable excuses for their conduct, as shown by their own confessions.

The charge had been raised that the Opposition had been entirely opposed to the construction of the line of railway, but he denied that such had been the case. They had only been opposed to the manner in which the scheme was laid before the House by the Government, and it was evident that from its inception the Government had made up their minds to degrade the great national work, and use it as a mere political engine to keep themselves in power. (*Hear, hear.*) He had always felt it necessary to construct the great work, so that a great trans-continental bond of communication might be made between the United Provinces.

It was impossible to recollect all the facts revealed by the recent disclosures without seeing that the sale of the Pacific Railway Charter was carefully and deliberately planned by the Government for the purpose of obtaining money with which to debauch the constituencies at the last general elections. (*Applause.*)

He admitted that the Crown had a right to prorogue Parliament, but he desired they would remember that it was possible to do a legal thing in an unconstitutional manner, and it was because there was an intimate connection between the prorogation and the issuing of the Royal Commission which was made to supersede a Parliamentary investigation, which Parliament had unanimously decided upon, that the rights and privileges of this House were clearly trampled upon. It had always been the province of the House of Commons to investigate the charges against its Ministers.

The Speaker had alluded to the opinions of Mr. Goldwin Smith upon the prorogation. He was one of the highest authorities on

constitutional law, and considered it was the most flagrant violation of the constitutional rights and privileges of a British community that had been heard of for generations, and dangerous to the liberties of the people. He (Mr. Young) said the Speech from the Throne did not say one single word as to the innocence of the Government of the charges brought against them, and did not make a single expression in favour of their vindication.

He then alluded to the statement of the Ministerial press that the Commissioners were required merely to report and not give any opinions regarding the evidence, when the very reverse was found to be the case. He complained of one of the points in the despatch to Lord Kimberly, which stated that the Parliament ceased to prosecute the enquiry. It did cease to prosecute the enquiry, but only after it was summarily turned out of doors by prorogation, and it was adding insult to injury to give this as a reason for the further outrage of the Royal Commission. (*Cheers.*)

The Government throughout the whole enquiry had done everything in its power to prevent a full investigation. He considered that the judges who presided at the Commission took part in the breach of the privileges of the House, and tended by their partisan and farcical action during the investigation to degrade the Bench and make mockery of justice. The charges made by the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) were practically substantiated. They had the fact brought out that the Ministers had importuned Sir Hugh Allan for money, which they received for the charter, and in the confessions of the Ministers themselves the amount of money they received was shown to be no less than \$162,000.

He maintained that no Government which had made such confessions could have a single day in England, and he would not believe that even in that House, which had been so corruptly elected, there could be found a majority which would approve of such shameless avowals. We were told there was not the slightest connection between the giving of the contract with the one hand and the taking of the money with the other. (*Hear, hear.*) He referred to the unparliamentary and vindictive manner in which the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government attacked the hon. member for Shefford when these charges were first made, and reminded the House that when the hon. member at a later period and entirely in self-defence, attempted to read the documentary evidence in his possession, the right hon. gentleman immediately changed his tone, and changed it very greatly, the hon. member for Shefford being once more transformed into an honourable and trustworthy gentleman.

It would be easily remembered that upon the occasion of the attack upon Hon. Mr. Huntington, that the Prime Minister, even with the name of his Maker upon his lips, asserted his entire innocence of the charge preferred against him, but what was the fact? Why, that it was proved by the confession made before the Commission by the right hon. Minister himself that he not only received \$45,000 from Sir Hugh Allan, but was guilty of corruption that seriously reflected upon the honour of public men in this country. (*Cheers.*) He also reminded the House that when the right

hon. gentleman was making the declaration at the elections in Ontario that "these hands are clean" the same hands were engaged in penning the last call for ten thousand dollars more. (*Cheers.*)

He pointed out the utter absurdity of the argument that this money was a mere election contribution; and it was a very curious style of subscription he said where the subscriber did not at once put down his name for any stated sum; but paid away money as the requests or requisitions were sent in, until the amount reached the immense sum of \$162,000. Neither did we ever before hear of a case where a subscriber refused to advance a cent until he had received a written promise that it would be all recouped to him, and Sir Hugh Allan took good care not to pay a dollar of this money until he had the written promise of the Premier that he should be made president of the Pacific Railway Company. (*Hear, hear.*)

The quibble made use of in this particular by the hon. member for Pictou (Hon. Mr. McDonald) was really surprising considering the character of the gentleman who brought it forward, and especially considering the gentleman to whom his remarks were being addressed. In fact, to hear the pleading of the hon. gentleman, one would almost suppose that instead of a speech in the Parliament of Canada, he was making a passionate appeal on behalf of some criminal to the hearts and sympathies of a common jury. (*Loud cheers.*)

He (Mr. Young) did not think it necessary to prove that there was a mutual bargain between the Government and Sir Hugh Allan, and he contended that in England if a Minister of the Crown or a Government were found guilty of giving a great public charter to a public contractor and at the same time receiving from that contractor \$162,000, that fact alone would be sufficient to condemn that Minister, or that Government, in the estimation of the people and Parliament of England, and he did not think that we in this country should adopt any lower standard of morals than they observed there. (*Cheers.*) We were continually pointed to England for the examples which we ought to follow and if their example were to be followed in the present instance, these gentlemen would not be supported except by their own votes in this chamber. (*Hear, hear.*) The bargain was as much a bargain whether reduced to writing or not, for when men bound themselves to fulfil a corrupt bargain it was not generally written, but if ever they did they took always very good care not to register it so that the eyes of their fellow men could see it.

It was simply adding insult to injury for the Government to tell this House and the country, to use Hon. Mr. Blake's brilliant illustration, that whilst they were giving the charter to Sir Hugh with one hand, and taking his gold with the other, the right hand did not know what the left hand was doing. (*Hear, hear.*) In the now famous letter of the 13th July, there was a specific stipulation that "any money advanced by you or your Company will be recouped to you;" and there was not a single gentleman upon the other side of the House who would argue that the members of the Government ever intended to pay back this money. The thing was simply absurd, for out of their official salaries it would have been impossible for

them to repay \$162,000 during a lifetime. There was therefore only one way of recouping him, which was by the Government giving him the charter for the Pacific Railway, upon such terms as would enable him to repay himself. (*Hear, hear.*) Recoup himself in other words out of the pocket of the people of Canada. (*Cheers.*)

He (Mr. Young) was inclined to think that in this particular, at least, the Government acted in good faith. He was sorry to say that in spite of what had been said by the hon. member from Vancouver (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks), that the hon. gentleman appeared to very poor advantage throughout the whole transaction. He (Mr. Young) would not detail the House at this late hour by going into the details of the charter granted to Sir Hugh Allan and out of the provisions of which he was to recoup himself for the money he had advanced, but he thought he would be able to show that from the nature of the charter, there would be much danger of Sir Hugh failing to make a very handsome speculation of it.

He then reviewed at some length the extraordinary clause, giving the Company the right to choose their grant of land from the best portions of the North-west, instead of taking the land in alternate blocks good and bad along the route, thus taking up, probably, all the land in the territory that was worth having, and an area equal to four provinces the size of Manitoba. He also referred to the rest of the conditions in their order, adding that the terms, as to the character and grading of the road, were so loosely drawn up, that the road might have been placed in our hands in such a condition as to be practically useless. He spoke of the inauspicious circumstances under which Sir Hugh Allan tried to float the scheme upon the market, and said that gentlemen had no surveys, no estimate of the cost; not the simplest elements of the information with regard to the undertaking which a capitalist would require, before embarking their money in it; besides, the impression was very general in England from the very first, that Sir Hugh and the Government had gone into the project in a corrupt way, in order to carry out their own personal ends more than to serve the requirements of the country. He contended that the action of the Government in taking money from Sir Hugh Allan under such circumstances was just as bad as if they put their hands directly into the public chest. (*Hear, hear.*)

He charged the Government, and he did so with regret, because it stained the honour of Canada, with having confessed themselves guilty to the charge of bribing the people of this country, and bribing them too, with their own money; and if this Parliament was going to solemnly sanction conduct of this description on the part of Ministers of the Crown, it would be better to decide at once that these Ministers should be commissioned to take money direct from the treasury instead of taking it from a contractor, and thus allow him to recoup himself at the public expense.

This last act, however, was only the continuation, as he hoped it would also be the collapse of the system of corruption by which the First Minister had maintained himself in power for the last twenty years (*hear, hear, and cheers*); and he made this statement boldly and fearlessly, notwithstanding the compliments and blandishments

heaped upon the right hon. gentleman by the members for Cumberland (Hon. Mr. Tupper) and Pictou (Hon. Mr. McDonald). He had always admitted the great ability of the Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald), his great suavity of manner, and his extensive acquaintance with the theory and practice of government; but if he was able to read his political course alright, and if he gave expression to the opinions of the people who sent him (Mr. Young) to represent them in this House, he would be bound to say that they considered him the most corrupt Prime Minister we have ever had in the country. (*Hear, hear.*)

He referred to the late Robert Walpole, of Britain, as a man much in the same position as that now occupied by the Prime Minister, and he contended that while the right hon. gentleman and his friends had for year and years told the public that to him was due the credit of carrying Confederation, he was the last leading public man to sign the report of the Committee in its favour, and only agreed when office was slipping from his grasp.

He referred to the miserable tactics resorted to by the Government in order to get new members to vote for them, and to show that they could not ask them to do so in accordance with any given principle, but for selfish ideas; but said that one of the new members had been disgusted by being told that if he did not vote for the Government he would not get the patronage of his county. He spoke of the necessity of purging the Government of this country

from the foul stain of corruption, before we could expect to be able to float our Pacific Railway scheme upon the English money market, and asserted that it was humiliating to hear the hon. member for Vancouver (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks), at his time of life, making such reckless and unsupported charges of corruption against members on this side of the House, considering the grave crime which had been brought home to the hon. gentlemen with whom he acted.

Deny it as they might, the Government now asked this House to make shipwreck of much that every country holds dear, as they asked that the sale of public charters, the corruption of the people, the infringement of our liberties, shall be solemnly sanctioned by the people's representatives; in short they asked that an open mockery shall be made of public virtue and public honour. He thanked God there was good reason to believe that this House had not sunk so low as that, and it must be the aspirations of every patriotic Canadian that our young nationality would emerge from the darkness and gloom of the present crisis with its old constitutional landmarks and public virtue re-established and purged of the presence of rulers who have disgraced their country and themselves. The hon. gentleman sat down amid loud applause.

Hon. Mr. WOOD then moved the adjournment of the debate and the House adjourned on the motion of Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald.