

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, October 27, 1873

The **SPEAKER** took the chair at 3 p.m.

Prayers

ELECTION COMMITTEES

The South Perth Election Committee reported that the petition was withdrawn.

Dundas Election Committee reported that they had adjourned till tomorrow, on account of the absence of Mr. Prévost.

Mr. MILLS moved that Mr. Prévost be summoned to attend in his place tomorrow.—Carried.

* * *

BROCKVILLE ELECTION COMMITTEE

Mr. SCATCERD presented the report of the Brockville Election Committee, stating that Mr. Buell was duly elected, and that neither the petition nor the defence was frivolous or vexatious.

The North Huron election Committee reported that they had adjourned till tomorrow, on account of the absence of Messrs. Joly and Flesher.

On motion by **Mr. CHISHOLM** they were ordered to attend in their places tomorrow.

* * *

LIBRARIAN'S REPORT

The **SPEAKER** submitted the report of the Librarian.

* * *

MANITOBA AMNESTY

Mr. LANTIER gave notice of motion respecting the granting of an amnesty which will be found in Notices of Motion.

* * *

PETITIONS

Several petitions were presented, including one from the Society of Friends, in favour of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

THE ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. WITTON, on rising to move the Address, in reply to the Speech from the Throne, said he was aware of the honour done him in asking him to move the Address, but he regretted that some more able member had not been asked to undertake the duty. He was aware that some of the matters referred to in the Speech had been subjects of very acrimonious discussion throughout the Dominion, but he relied upon the consideration of the House in the remarks which he might make upon them. (*Cheers.*) However different the opinions which were entertained in relation to the constitution of the Royal Commission might be, they must feel gratified that the whole matter had now come to the House for decision; that the inquiry had been inquisitorial and not judicial, and that the whole question had been relegated to this High Court of Parliament for a judicial, fair, and satisfactory decision. He left the matter in the hands of those who would follow him.

Referring to the clause with respect to the representation of the people in Parliament, he said provision was to be made by which the tone of political morality in this country would be raised, and also to extend the franchise to many who did not now possess it. He did not believe that *vox populi* was always the *vox Dei*, but he considered that the view of the whole people was generally more just than that of a part. It was advisable to give to those who settled amongst them the rights of citizenship, for if they did not those persons would probably be agitators, and would also, like the enfranchised class in England, prove the leper spot on the Constitution.

He believed they would all unite in expressing their gratification at the union of Prince Edward Island with the Dominion. (*Loud cheers.*) They did well to be gratified at it, not because they secured their neighbour's vineyard (*laughter*), or for any other selfish motive, but because they desired the Islanders to join with them in working out the glorious destiny of this Dominion. (*Cheers.*) It was, he believed, the last link almost of the chain which would bind us together in one homogeneous nationality.

With respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the charter granted to the Company had been useless to them. He did not know much about the question, but as far as he could learn the railway would be cheap at whatever price we might pay for it, and he believed that the feeling of the House was that we must have a railway. We must have a railway to keep our contract with British Columbia, to settle those vast dominions of the North-west, and to fill our eastern granaries with the products of those most fertile regions. However the railway might be built on what route it might; both were open

questions. But he believed that the members on both sides of the House, or many of them, were determined, and always had been, that this road must be built, and that this was the policy foreshadowed in the Address.

The next paragraph referred to the increase required in the assistance given to the Government in their Parliamentary and Executive duties. The Government was only an Executive Committee of the nation, and should have a sufficient and efficient staff to enable it to carry on the work of the nation. The question of regulating navigation had received great attention at the hands of the Home Government. Canada occupied a very important position in maritime affairs, and everything concerning them would receive great consideration at the hands of the House.

With regard to the proposed Board of Agriculture, he believed the establishment of such a body would be a step in the right direction, and showed that more attention was to be paid to this interest. The Insolvency Law was a most important question; a great part of the business of the country was carried on by promises to pay, and if they treated those who failed too rigidly they might drive them away from the country. Great care however had to be exercised that the dishonest trader did not participate in the advantage given to him who was only unfortunate.

There was reference made in one of the clauses of the Address to the establishment of a Court of Appeal. He might say that so far as the laity were concerned, anything which tended to make the administration of justice swift and sure, and judgments just, would be acceptable to them.

As to emigration, which came next, he said that to make our country great we should endeavour to fill up our vacant land. At present our settlements formed but a narrow fringe along our great lakes and rivers. He, therefore, believed that we did well to bring in people from abroad to help us in developing the great resources which this country possessed. He believed that in view of our great resources, our lakes and rivers, our minerals and our fine soil, our country was destined to become one of the greatest in the world. He presumed that those measures foreshadowed the policy of the Government. They had his cordial approval—(*cheers*)—as he believed they would also receive the approval of the House. (*Loud cheers.*)

Mr. BABY (in French) seconded the address. In doing so he said he fully sympathized with the remarks of the gentleman who had preceded him, and, like him, he must throw himself upon the forbearance of the House. The first clause of the Speech from the Throne referred to the somewhat celebrated Royal Commission, appointed to enquire into the Pacific Railway scandal; the Commissioners, who were three able, intelligent, and honest men, men of the highest integrity, had made an investigation which would supply sufficient matter for the House, to form its judgment upon, whatever that judgment might be. In passing to the second paragraph, with reference to the entrance of Prince Edward Island into confederation, he said that Province would greatly aid us in our

endeavours to make the same flag flutter over all Her Majesty's North American possessions. He, therefore, gave a cordial welcome in this Chamber to the members sent by that Province to represent them, and hoped that the whole of British North America would soon be brought into the same union, and that the great people so constituted would soon show themselves worthy of a place amongst the nations of the world.

He would next pass on to the pledge given of a new election law, a measure which had been previously promised. The dearest rights of the people rested in the merit of elections (*Hear, hear, and ironical cheers*) and with a proper law the people would feel assured that none of their rights or privileges would be infringed. He had perfect confidence that the measure which the Government would submit would be as comprehensive and perfect as could possibly be proposed.

He regretted that the Pacific Railway Company had given up their charter, but was glad to find that the Government would introduce a measure for the purpose of enabling them to proceed with the work themselves. He spoke of the necessity of having a national road to connect all the Provinces of the Dominion, and considered our Confederation would be of little avail if we had not the means of internal communications between all the Provinces. To secure the building of this road all should combine, for it was an object the country heartily desired to see accomplished.

He briefly glanced at several of the other clauses of the address, advocating the passage of an Insolvency law and the establishment of a Dominion Board of Agriculture, the intention of which was to foster that most important of our industries, the cultivation of the soil. Upon the other points he endorsed the remarks of the preceding speaker, and concluded by expressing his confidence in the great future that lay before the Dominion.

The motion for the consideration of the address to his Excellency was then carried, and the Address taken up clause by clause. The first was adopted.

On the second clause,

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said that before this paragraph was put, he desired in the first place to make some remarks that were necessary in the critical stage of our history, and also to make a motion in amendment to the Address. No one appreciated more keenly the gravity of the crisis in which the country and this House was now placed, and he would endeavour to speak dispassionately on the one great question which concerned the power of the Administration and the of the country, and was vitally connected with its future prosperity.

The crisis which now existed was not to be looked upon as a mere party movement, either on the one side or the other. He knew that many gentlemen who looked upon the different parties from a different point of view from himself would be certain to take the view that he took. He was perfectly aware that in reference to this question, he did not depend alone upon those who usually

supported him, and that he could with confidence depend upon a sufficient number of gentlemen holding a general political view, somewhat antagonistic to his own, to secure a majority for the motion he was about to make. (*Opposition cheers.*) But even if he had not that confidence in the intelligence of the House and in the opinion of the country, it would still no less be his duty to submit his motion.

He desired before entering practically upon the discussion of the questions connected with the letting of the Pacific Railway contract, to review very briefly the circumstances under which this contract was let. It was well known that the Administration, during the first Parliament, had been gradually losing the confidence of the country, and they found that some unusual means must be used to secure their maintenance in power. He then referred to the terms of union with British Columbia relating to the pledge to complete the Pacific Railway within ten years; to the terms of the Pacific Railway Act; and to the extraordinary powers conferred on the Government by that Act.

While the contract for carrying the mails across the Atlantic, amounting to only 25,000 pound sterling, was annually submitted to Parliament, the contract for the Pacific Railway, amounting to \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land, was left entirely in the hands of the Government. This was a most extraordinary, not to say suspicious, circumstance. One of the symptoms of the decaying power of the Government was manifested in 1871, when the Ontario Government was defeated, principally because of its close connection and submission to the Ottawa Government.

Shortly after this election, Ministers perceiving that they could not carry the elections by legitimate means, were preparing for the event which was realized before the House met last year. Unless some sinister object was to be attained, there could be no reason why the Government should refuse to submit the Pacific contract to Parliament, but the Government knew that their influence was waning in the country, and they were preparing for the events which followed.

There were other evidences of that fact. The Ministry knew that if their course was submitted to the people in such a way as to secure an unbiased and unpurchased opinion of the country, it would be quite impossible for them to remain in office; accordingly they resisted every measure introduced for the purpose of purifying our electoral system, and would it be judging them too harshly when he said that the only possible motive that could fairly be attributed to this course was that they had resolved to carry the elections at all hazards, even if improper means had to be used. (*Opposition cheers.*) That was the opinion generally formed, and it was an opinion which set at rest the accusation which had been brought against many members by gentlemen opposite when they knew that every man on that side of the House was prepared to give his sanction to the most stringent possible enactment to prevent undue influence being exercised at these elections. (*Cheers.*)

It would be remembered that on the passing of the Interim Elections Act these gentlemen opposite took power to appoint

returning officers. He suggested on this side of the House, and moved in that direction at the time, that all returning officers ought to be *ex officio* officers taken from some official class from whom we might fairly expect uniform fairness and justice. He could only say that in all the elections, so far as his individual experience went the most bitter partisans were chosen. We knew that through some of the returning officers, two or three gentlemen at least were deprived of the seats which they had won from the electors. They knew these gentlemen were appointed because of their partisanship; they knew that these men used every means in their power to vex and annoy those electors who were opposed to the Government; they knew that in any district where it was supposed there would be a close election, that all the poll clerks, etc., were appointed from the supporters of the Opposition, in order that they might be disfranchised; they knew that in order to accomplish an object, in some of the Provinces a system was put into operation different from that which prevailed in the other Provinces. They knew that while in Ontario and Quebec no revenue officer was permitted to vote, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick they were allowed to vote, in order that Minister and Ministerial supporters might drive them like cattle to the polls. (*Cheers, and cries of no, no.*)

Hon. Mr. TUPPER: No, no.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman said "No, no." Would the hon. gentleman when he spoke, give a reason for the introduction of an unequal law. Such was the state of our laws, when the general elections took place, and they knew that in Ontario and Quebec, where it was unlawful for certain officers to go to the polls, were authorized to go to the elections and influence the voters, and that the powers of the Government were strained to the uttermost to influence the elections unduly. They knew that prominent officials had used their influence to intimidate electors, and he had during the last session read letters in the House in respect to this matter, but they knew that in the great Province of Ontario, and, at all events, to a great extent, in the Province of Quebec, all these preparations for the electoral struggle proved that, in spite of the utmost efforts of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, in his travels through the west, aided, as he was, by the hon. gentleman from Vancouver and other gentlemen, that all their efforts and something else that he would refer to further on—(*Hear, hear, from the Opposition*)—proved fruitless, and that the right hon. gentleman was unable to make his appearance in the House with a majority from his own Province. Such were the results of the policy that had characterised the Administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite that the use of all the influences that I have already referred to were utterly useless to accomplish the objects they had in view, and the right hon. gentlemen opposite was scarcely at work in his canvassing tour before it became apparent to him, with great astuteness, that something more, to which he had referred, was necessary to secure himself in power, and that his destinies must be placed on something less fallible than the legal expression of the people's will. Accordingly, they found that a movement was made among those who proposed to construct the Pacific Railway. They found that in all parts of the country, especially in Montreal and Toronto, interviews were being held and

letters being written, and that early in the electoral campaign the right hon. gentleman opposite relied upon this source as the means to accomplish the object, which the means in his hands failed to proffer him.

The Premier stated in his evidence before the Commission—“When Sir George Cartier and I parted in Ottawa, he to go to Montreal and I to go to Toronto, of course, as leading members of the Government, we were anxious for the success of our parliamentary supporters at the elections, and I said to Sir George that the severest contest would be in Ontario, where we might expect to receive all the opposition that the Ontario Government could give to us and to our friends at the polls. I said to him, you must try and raise such funds as you can to help us, as we are going to have the chief battle there. I mentioned the names of a few friends to whom he might apply, and Sir Hugh Allan amongst the rest, and that he was interested in all those enterprises which the Government had been forwarding. When, therefore, I ascertained that Sir George had put all right with his friends, I then communicated to my friends in Montreal, Sir George and Mr. Abbott, stating I hoped they would not forget our necessities; that they would see to raise some funds for us in Ontario.” Then he told the Commission a little farther on that there was an urgent necessity for spending money.

All this showed that the Premier felt the weakness of his Administration in the country, and that if he was to be retained in power some other means must be used beyond these that would be considered legitimate, and they were asked to believe that these obligations to Sir Hugh Allan were simply obligations of party, and that the contributions were the contributions of a friend. They were also asked to vote that black was white, and declare it was the most reasonable thing in the world for a gentleman in Sir Hugh Allan’s position to give this money simply as a member of the party, although he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) was bound to say that Sir Hugh Allan did not venture to say anything of that kind in his evidence. No, they were told very plainly by that gentleman that he had no party views at all. Here was his opinion of the situation. They had that calm, steady, business man—that wary, would he say, politician,—no, he never was a politician—they had that wary merchant speaking in this wise. In a private letter which had since become private property,

From the **GOVERNMENT BENCHES**: “How”?

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON: What has that to do with the matter?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he was about to read from a private letter to a friend, Mr. Cass, who was engaged with him in these transactions. He said on a calm review of the situation, I satisfied myself that the whole decision of the question must ultimately be in the hands of one man, and that man was Sir George-É. Cartier, the leader and chief of the French party. This party has held the balance of power between the other factions. It has sustained and kept in office and existence the entire Government for the last five years. So utterly regardless was he of

any party politics that he stood quietly by to see to which party he would be likely to apply in order to carry out his purpose. After having reviewed the portion of the party led by Sir John A. and Sir George-É Cartier, he concluded that he was the man who should be applied to.

Hon. Sir Hugh Allan said in another place, “Everything looks well up till the present item, but I may tell you in strict confidence that there are symptoms of coolness between Sir John A. and Cartier, arising from the coquetting of the letter with Blake and Mackenzie to form an alliance and carry the election next summer, with a view to leave John A. out in the cold. This would not be quite so well for us.” He knew if the hon. gentleman were left out in the cold the probability was that he also would be left out in the cold. (*Hear, hear.*)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: Is that true?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman asked if this was true. The hon. gentleman should have asked his friend Sir Hugh Allan. The hon. gentleman had, as no one else had, an opportunity of asking questions. He had a chance of having a minister to put questions to him and of questioning every one else. The wary merchant then adds:—“But this would not be quite so well for us.” He knew that if the right hon. gentleman were left out in the cold he himself would be utterly left in the cold.

He said further in his letter of the 16th July, “A kind of negotiation is going on with both Macpherson and myself, relative to the composition of this Government Company, but it has not come to anything as yet; meantime the period of the election is drawing near, and, unless the matter is arranged satisfactorily to Lower Canada, Sir George Cartier’s prospect of being returned is very slim indeed.”

In his letter of the 1st of July to Mr. Cass, he also said respecting the French party, “It consists of forty-five men, who have followed Cartier and voted in a solid phalanx for all his measures. The Government majority in Parliament being generally less than forty-five, it follows that the defection of one-half or two-thirds would at any time put the Government out of office.” It was a business matter. But further than that, they would produce evidence that he was simply playing the part of a great gamester, that he had a game before him which he wished to carry, and anything that would insure the carrying out of that game was adopted. (*Hear, hear.*)

He told them in the letter of the 28th of February, “Our Legislature meets on the 11th of April, and I am already deep in preparation for the game.” In another letter the 6th of August, 1872, he apparently thought the game was accomplished,—“The near approach of the elections, however, and the stand taken by my French friends, that they would lend no help till I pronounced myself satisfied, has at length brought the matter to a crisis, and I think the game I have been playing is now likely to be attended with success;” and the man who was asserted to have given \$360,000 as a contribution to the elections, this was the man who was said to have placed in the hands of the members of the

Government and their immediate supporters a sum of no less—by the confessions of the Ministers, contained in the book from which he was quoting—than \$162,000 and, with their intervention, \$17,000 or \$18,000 for their friends. There was a balance of \$200,000 spent in other ways the report did not condescend to notice, and which the Commission did not condescend to ask about.

Now, he had no hesitation in saying, after a thorough examination of the points, that Sir Hugh Allan was not prepared to advance a cent for the purpose of aiding the elections of Ministers till the Ministers had secured for him the contract. (*Hear, hear, and applause.*) He would be able to prove out of the evidence laid before them that the payment of the money and the reception of the promise were contemporaneous. (*Applause.*)

A VOICE: The promise?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: The promise. (*Loud applause from the Government benches.*) Hon. gentlemen seemed to think the promise and the giving of the contract were not the same thing. He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) regarded them as the same. They knew from the evidence produced in the papers before them, that up to the time of that ominous week, about the 13th July, the attitude of Sir Hugh was hostile to the election of Sir George-É. Cartier and his friends. He told of the pressure he brought to bear upon the Government in the passage of the letter that he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) had read, from Sir Hugh to Mr. Cass, one of his United States accomplices, in which he referred to the party that had held the balance of power, led by Sir George. It was evident to Sir Hugh that some means would have to be adopted to secure the influence of this party, and as soon as he made up his mind as to the best course to be pursued, he lost not a moment in carrying it out.

Now there was another circumstance. There was the studious effort made in giving the evidence to induce the impression that Sir Hugh had merely been given the presidency of the Company. What did he say himself in reference to that? He said in his letter of the 1st of July, “No doubt he (alluding to McMullen, no doubt) informed you that—thinking as I had taken up the project, there must be something very good in it—a very formidable opposition was organized in Toronto” for the purpose of obtaining that something good which Sir Hugh saw looming in the distance.

It appeared from the proceedings that it became absolutely necessary that this money should be secured. The first elections, he thought, took place during the latter part of July and the first of August. In the meantime the parties were brought together and Sir Hugh Allan was found, and also Mr. Abbott and Sir George-É. Cartier, in company in Montreal. In order to complete the transaction, he would read a passage from the evidence to show the very simple way in which this money was obtained, how little work there was about it, and how little this wealthy capitalist thought about it when he was asked for an extraordinary amount of money. It would be remembered that Sir Hugh Allan, Mr. Abbott, and Sir George-É. Cartier, on the morning of that day upon which the letter known as the letter of the 30th of July, was drafted and agreed

upon, that document was somewhat longer at first than in the form in which it was finally adopted.

The following is the quotation from the evidence:—“Question.—I should like to hear again if you remember the way in which Sir George approached the subject of a money subscription? Answer—It was in a very abrupt manner. As we were going out at the door. After arranging the first letter of the 30th July, he turned about and said, ‘Will you help us at our elections?’ or ‘Are you going to help us?’ or something to that effect. Question—Did you make a reply? Answer—I did. Question—What was it? Answer—I said that I had been always in the habit of giving something to the elections, and no doubt I would do so on this occasion.” (*Ironical cheers.*) But Sir Hugh did not inform us to what extent he had given money at previous elections. (*Hear, hear.*) Nor were any questions asked him upon that point, but those who were in a position to judge pretty nearly of the amount, and knew the close business capacities of the gentleman, asserted that it was infinitesimally small. The speaker continued the quotation from the evidence: “Question—Who spoke next, and what was next said? Answer—I am not sure, but I think it is possible that I said to him, ‘To what extent will you require assistance’, or ‘what do you want’, and I also suggested that he should put in writing what he wanted.”

It never occurred to Sir Hugh Allan that any other assistance would be asked except in money. He said in one of his letters that he had accomplished great results by going among the people and addressing meetings, but it never presented itself to his mind that he was greatly required to speak on behalf of the administration. He said himself that the answer he gave to the question the very moment it was asked was “to what extent do you require assistance.” It seemed even before this point was reached, that there was a perfect understanding that there was money in the matter (*hear, hear*), because he had told us in a letter that he had already paid out \$8,500 and was unable to get any receipt or any voucher. (*Cheers.*) That, in short, they would have to go it blind in the matter of money. (*Loud cheers.*) In his letter of February 28th, 1872, he said: “I think you will have to go it blind in the matter of money (cash payments).” (*Laughter.*) “I have already paid \$8,500 and have not a voucher, and cannot get one.” (*Cheers and laughter.*)

We have no evidence to show where these \$8,500 went, but we did know that it was spent in some way or another. Sir Hugh did not dare to ask for a receipt, and did not require a voucher to present to his accomplices in the United States, but the reason for this had not been ascertained. A question was put, “Your recollection is that he said \$100,000 would be wanted?” and the answer was—“Yes; Mr. Abbott thinks he did not mention any definite amount. Question—After he named that sum, what did you ask him to do? Answer—To put a request in writing.” Why did he wish the request put in writing? His own answer was, “I wished to have some authority for payment, and to know what I was doing.” (*Hear, hear.*) “Question—What purpose did you think that would serve? Answer—Nothing, beyond being more satisfactory to myself. Men of business generally require things to be done in that way.” (*Hear, hear.*)

The way the merchant seemed to have suspected that even after the promise was given, that the promise possibly might be broken; and, therefore, he wanted, in the first place, a written request for the money; and in the second place, the receipt for the money paid. After this conversation took place, Sir Hugh Allan and Mr. Abbott retired, and presumably went to the office of the latter, and there drew out the formal letter for Sir George as follows:—

“Dear Sir Hugh,—The friends of the Government will expect to be assisted with funds in the pending elections, and any amount which you or your Company shall advance for that purpose shall be recouped to you. A memorandum of the immediate requirements is below.”

“Very truly yours,”

“George-Étienne Cartier”

“Sir Hugh Allan.”

“Now wanted:—Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, \$25,000, Hon. Mr. Langevin, \$15,000; Sir George-Étienne Cartier, \$20,000; Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, additional \$10,000; Hon. Mr. Langevin, additional \$10,000; Sir George-Étienne Cartier, \$30,000.” This showed that Sir Hugh Allan was resolved, as had already been said, to have the matter put in the best possible business order before he advanced this money to enable the Government to spend it in carrying the elections, and he had the promise of the contract at this time. By the evidence laid before the House it appeared there had been some agreement, but that does not appear to have been brought out; however, the evidence was conclusive as it stood, that Sir Hugh Allan refused to advance any money until he was assured that he and his associates would get the contract. Then he at once began to pay out money. Then we found that in writing to his associates, Sir Hugh Allan said, as they might well suppose, the matter had not reached this point without expense. (*Hear, hear.*) That is before the contract had been obtained. He also tells them again that \$8,500 had been paid out, and that much larger sums would be required, but that a portion of them were not payable until the contract was secured.

Again, on the 6th of August he tells them he thinks it will altogether reach about \$300,000. That letter read as follows:—“This position has not been attained without large payments of money. I have already paid over \$200,000 and I will have at least \$100,000 more to pay. I must now soon know what our New York friends are going to do. They did not answer my last letter.” This showed that he expected his associates in New York to repay this sum. It was a part of the bargain. He said that point had not been reached without large expenditure, and he had still a large sum to pay, and it appears clear that in doing these things he was acting in pursuance of an agreement. This was the evidence produced by hon. gentlemen opposite.

He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) might also remark upon the nature of the proceedings in another case, where the hon. member for Hochelaga waited upon this generous contributor, who had become

all at once a strong party man (*ironical cheers*), and who had signed requisitions for tens of thousands of dollars without scruple. It really looked as if Sir Hugh had all at once become the self-constituted treasurer of the right hon. gentleman, opposite, and was supposed to be in a position to pay any amount he was asked for. (*Cheers.*) We were told by some persons that this money was merely given on loan (*Hear, hear*), but where was the evidence of that in the documents laid before the House. (*Cheers.*) To be sure, Sir Hugh Allan said a little about it in this way. The letter of Sir George-É. Cartier of the 24th August, of which a copy is published, is in these terms “In the absence of Sir Hugh Allan, I shall be obliged by your supplying the Central Committee with a further sum of \$20,000 upon the same conditions as the amount written by one at the foot of my letter to Sir Hugh Allan on the 30th ultimo.”

(Signed)

“George-É. Cartier”,

“P.S. Please also send Sir John A. Macdonald \$10,000 more on the same terms.”

If it was a subscription why should it have to be recouped, or why should a promise of repayment be given? Hon. gentlemen opposite must either defend it as a subscription or prove it as a loan. They had been defending it on both grounds. What was meant by these expressions, the Commissioner asks “the same conditions” and “the same terms”? “It is difficult to say,” Sir Hugh replied, “What Sir George meant by those words. He was not a man with whom you could talk very much, because in all the interviews with him he generally did most of the talking himself, and you could with difficulty say anything. I never understood exactly what he meant on any of these points. I was quite satisfied that he probably felt that he did not like to be under such very heavy obligations, and would endeavour at some future time to make it up by subscription or otherwise. I did not think he had any very definite idea, and I did not think it would be done.” Here was the language Sir Hugh made use of. He knew that the money was given for the promise of the contract, and having got that promise it followed, as a matter of course, that he knew there was to be no recouping in the business. (*Cheers.*)

He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) produced his own evidence in proof of the assertion that there could not be any expectation of having the amount repaid. Sir Hugh Allan stated so himself in the correspondence with his American associates. On the 6th of August he wrote that he had already paid out over \$200,000, and would have at least \$100,000 more to pay, and he wished to know what his New York friends were going to do in the matter of repaying him. He gave those who were associated with him constant intelligence of the amounts paid, and they had already advanced him \$40,000, as part payment of this money. (*Hear, hear, and cheers.*)

In his letter of the 16th of September, when it was to be presumed, the great fund was completely exhausted, and when they had got all they wanted, the last election having taken place on the 14th September, he wrote in this way. “I have disbursed \$343,000 in

gold, which I want to get repaid. I have still to pay \$13,500, which will close everything off. I will go to New York as soon as the contract is signed, say about the 7th October, and would be glad to meet you there at that time." It was quite evident from these expressions in the correspondence that he never looked to the Administration to recoup the money he had advanced, but it was to be repaid by his associates in the United States. (*Loud cheers.*)

In still another passage, where he points out that he would have to pay money, it would be recollected that it was stated that his American associates were to retain six of the ten millions of capital which the Company were to subscribe, the other four to be distributed among the Provinces of Canada. He also pointed out in his letter of the 7th of August that in bringing the matter to this point, the expenses had been very great, and he had already paid away about \$250,000, and would have to pay at least \$50,000 more before the end of the month. He did not know that even this would finish it, but he hoped so. He continued:—of course, this will all have to come from the subscriptions of the six millions stock. I had shown that he did not look even to his Company as a whole to have the amounts repaid. The advancement of these amounts was to be kept secret from Mr. Macpherson, and the other Canadians, and probably from the gentlemen of the Lower Provinces. The American associates of Sir Hugh Allan, who were to own the six millions of stock, were to pay the whole amount which had been advanced, except, perhaps, any sums that might have come out of Sir Hugh's own pocket.

He thought he had established very conclusively two or three propositions. In the first place, that Sir Hugh Allan absolutely refused, not only to lend any monetary assistance but that he refused to assist in the elections in any way, until he had assurance of this contract. (*Cheers.*) He had, in fact, endeavoured to inflame the minds of the Lower Canadians against Sir George-É. Cartier until Sir George was compelled to yield, and it was said that Sir George, in order to be even with him, raised opposition to the election of Mr. Abbott in the County of Argenteuil. He made this reference with the greatest possible regret, that he was compelled to use the name of a gentleman with whom he was long associated as a member of this House, although not in an official capacity, and who was now no more, and he would deal with his memory as gently as the circumstances would permit. The fact was now established by the evidence produced by hon. gentlemen opposite themselves, that instead of Sir Hugh Allan being considered a member for the Ministerial party, he was simply an actual speculator and merchant. He told us himself, that he was no politician, and never voted at a parliamentary election except once.

He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) need not refer to the severe contests which his hon. friends, Messrs. Holton and Dorion and their party had had in the City of Montreal, where this gentleman exercised a paramount commercial influence. To show that that influence was not brought to bear upon these contracts upon any former occasion, Sir Hugh himself, told us that he never tried to exercise that influence, and never voted but the once at an election in his life. (*Hear, hear.*) If evidence more conclusive could be asked for to

prove that Sir Hugh was simply proceeding as an ordinary business matter, he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) was utterly unable to read the logic of events as they presented themselves in our minds; but the very moment the arrangement was made on the 30th of July, an assurance was given to this man of business that he should obtain the contract for himself and his friends.

How much money was then mentioned? Sir Hugh and Mr. Abbott did not agree about it. One statement was that it would be about \$100,000, but Mr. Abbott thought it was simply stated that a large sum would be required. It seemed very extraordinary that one, two, three or four hundred thousand dollars should be asked from Sir Hugh Allan at all, but it was perfectly incredible that Sir Hugh should have given it, except as a consideration for the promise of the contract. In his evidence Sir Hugh told us that, but in his letter to his American associates of the 7th of August, he further said, "It is unnecessary to detail the various phases through which it passed, but the result is that we yesterday signed an agreement by which, on certain monetary conditions, they agree to form a company, of which I am to be president; to suit my views, to give me and my friends a majority of the stock, and to give the Company so formed the contract to build the road on the terms of the Act of Parliament."

From the evidence it appears that the monetary conditions referred to in that letter were those which Sir George-É. Cartier wrote, and where the amounts of money required to carry on the elections were stated. It would be remembered that when the publication of Sir Hugh Allan's correspondence first took place, there was a very general expression of disbelief in its genuineness, and it was supposed to be more or less interpolated with expressions which could not have been true, and we have the spectacle of many newspapers in the interest of the right hon. gentleman opposite asserting that if these letters were genuine there was surely something wrong in the matter.

He had a perfect recollection of hearing gentlemen say, who followed the right hon. Premier, and of seeing articles in newspapers of the same principles assert that all this might have taken place without the knowledge of the right hon. gentleman or his Administration, and that Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, as leader of the government at the time that this contract was given, knew nothing of the existence of those letters, or that if they did, it proved conclusively that he was a party to the transaction.

Now what was the truth about this? That if the evidence produced before the Commission established anything, it established this. This was what took place before the Commission on this point in the examination of the right hon. gentleman himself. "Question—Mr. McMullen's letters seemed to allege that copies were given you of certain letters between him and Sir Hugh Allan. Did you see those letters? Answer—On the 23rd of January he saw me and said he would send me copies, and he did send me copies. Question—Are these copies of the originals, which were afterwards included in the sealed packet? Answer—Yes, I think so. I have got them. Question—Are you able to state whether these copies you

have, are the originals here? Answer—I have got all the copies. It would take some time to bring them now, as they are at my house. Question—You will produce them tomorrow? Answer—I did not get them on the 23rd of January. He promised to send me copies of all the papers, and I subsequently got them.” Thus it was shown that these copies were in possession of the Government at the time the contract was finally given, or if the actual copies were not that according to the right hon. gentleman’s own statement, Mr. McMullen read portions of them to him.

With regard to that correspondence, before he closed his reference to that portion of his subject, he would call attention to the very remarkable proceeding of Mr. Abbott and Sir Hugh Allan in reference thereto. That correspondence had actually been defended since its publication as perfectly legitimate and proper. When Mr. Abbott was before the Commission and when speaking of the interview between himself, Sir Hugh Allan and Mr. McMullen, with reference to the deposit of the packet of papers in Mr. Starnes’ hands, the payment of \$20,000 to Mr. McMullen, the retention of \$17,500, the question was put to him, was it at your suggestion that a portion of the money be withheld? “Answer. Yes. Question—You were acting as solicitor for Sir Hugh Allan? Answer—Yes. Question—And thought it a reasonable and proper precaution to take? Answer—Yes. I thought it possible that there might be copies of those letters extant, and that no sooner would the money be paid than copies might appear in the newspapers. I thought that the retention of a portion of the money would operate as a check against anything of this sort. He was to retain them until within ten days after the end of the coming session of Parliament. Question—Why was that time fixed upon? Answer—Just for the same reason as any other time might have been fixed upon, in order to give sufficient time to enable the delegation to go to England and return”. The publication then would be better than during the session of Parliament, as it would create less noise and scandal than during the session.

Mr. Abbott was a wise man in his generation. (*Cheers and laughter.*) He appeared occasionally as the confidant of that Prince of speculators, Sir Hugh Allan. Sometimes he apparently acted as his solicitor, sometimes as a person interested in the business himself, and sometimes as the apparent confidant of the right hon. gentleman opposite. (*Cheers.*) What his real position was he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) did not know, but he knew from his evidence that he was apprehensive that if the publication of these letters took place before the rising of Parliament there would be a considerable row over it. It was extremely desirable that this should be prevented, and he trusted to the chapter of accidents and the lapse of time, that something would turn up before they would get abroad, that would deaden the effect of their publication. They were published, nevertheless, and we knew the facts. If this money was a mere subscription, how was it that the amount of the subscription was never told. Was it the original amount, or was there a maximum sum fixed, upon which drafts might be made (*Hear, hear*). Mr. Abbott seemed to have a *carte blanche* to pay whatever drafts were required, and we found in the correspondence published some very remarkable telegrams, such, for instance, as that bearing

the signature of the right hon. gentleman opposite, asserting that he must have ten thousand more (*great cheering*), and that it would be the last time of a calling. (*Cheers.*)

We also found Mr. Abbott authorizing the right hon. gentleman to draw upon him for the \$10,000 additional, so that we see the drafts were not confined to the amount named on the requisition of Sir George-É. Cartier; but were made just as the political exigence of the prime mover in the matter demanded. It was also found that at the time of this last call, the elections were nearly all over, and only twelve or thirteen were to take place, there was no doubt it must have been in some of these counties that money thus required was spent. The election in South Victoria was one of the last that took place; was there a portion of the \$10,000 spent in this County, or where was it spent? (*Cheers.*)

He was bound to say that Mr. Abbott was generous in matters relating to the expenditure of money. (*Cheers and laughter.*) In his evidence before the Commission he informed us that so zealous had he become in the interest of the party, which he was practically opposing a few weeks before, that in his opinion three times the money would have been well spent if it had been necessary to keep a Government in power which has, according to Sir Hugh Allan’s views and his own, the improvement of the country so much at heart as this Government appeared to have. (*Ironical cheers.*) These very same gentlemen, who thought nothing would have been too dear a price to keep the Government in power, had only a few weeks before done their best to break down this Government unless they came to terms. (*Loud cheers.*) At least such was the general belief. The hon. gentlemen opposite laughed at this, but it was no secret and Sir Hugh Allan himself said that he was making matters so hot for Sir George-É. Cartier in Montreal, that he would be compelled to come to terms. (*Cheers.*) And it was well known that his efforts in that direction had gone so far that it was impossible to counteract them in time to save the election.

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON: He declares that himself.

(*Cries of order, order.*)

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he did not at all complain of the interruption. (*Cheers and laughter.*)

He would just say a few words more upon the money matter before he passed on. He had already referred to the very extraordinary parliamentary electioneering utterances of the right hon. gentleman opposite. It appeared that in certain places where the right hon. gentleman appeared, that he felt it necessary to deny the imputation that he had employed any money at the elections. He would make a quotation from an article in the right hon. gentleman’s own paper, and leave it to Mr. Abbott to say whether he had received or been promised any money on behalf of the elections at that time. The occasion was the nomination for South Perth at St. Mary’s on the 19th August, and the following was the quotation referred to:—“He appealed to Mr. Kidd to say whether he had received or been promised any money from the Government to

carry on the contest in South Perth.” Mr. Kidd replied “Not a farthing.” Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald said the same answer would be given by every candidate in Ontario if appealed to. Was it possible that this money was not used at the elections, or was the language made use of on the hustings at Perth North, simply for the purpose of endeavouring to create the impression that the elections he won were simply gained on account of the right hon. gentleman and his administration. (*Hear, hear.*) He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) put the right hon. gentleman’s own statement against his own evidence and left it to the gentleman himself to explain them. (*Cheers.*)

Referring to the charges of Hon. Mr. Huntington, he said it would be remembered that when the matter was first brought up in the House there was an extreme dislike manifested to a Parliamentary inquiry, and the proposition was voted down by a considerable majority, that majority believing that it was impossible that charges so extraordinary could be true; but the right hon. gentleman moved for the Committee himself afterwards and the Committee was appointed by the House.

When the Oaths’ bill was introduced and got through this House—not as fast as it might, but still it was not detained very long—when it went to the Upper House the colleagues of the right hon. gentleman there refused to take charge of it, and although they finally did so, it remained a very long time in this House, and before the investigation could proceed some thirty days had elapsed. It was expected then that the proceedings would be gone into at once and the first meeting was accordingly held on the 5th of May, the charge having been preferred on the 2nd of April.

Following the course of the Administration upon this question up to the present time, it was tolerably evident from the first that the intention was to delay the enquiry being preceded with as much as possible. When the Committee met on the 5th day of May, it was adjourned again till the 6th, and on the 7th, the report was presented, which adjourned the Committee to a distant day after the House would have risen. On the 14th day of that month, Hon. Mr. Huntington moved for certain papers to be impounded—that is the papers which were deposited in the hands of Mr. Starnes, and which contained the correspondence of Sir Hugh with his American associates. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House endeavoured to prevent the adjournment of the Committee on the ground that it was not necessary that the accomplices of the accused should be present. It was urged upon the other side of the House that it would be unfair in their absence to proceed with the enquiry, but as they were only wanted as witnesses, it was difficult to understand how that conclusion was arrived at. The ground was taken upon this side of the House that the evidence of the witnesses who might present themselves might and should be taken immediately, and he for one thought that the non-presence of Sir Hugh and Mr. Abbott was a very remarkable excuse for this adjournment.

In Courts of Justice witnesses were frequently excluded until the evidence of other witnesses had been taken, but unless the Administration argued that the evidence of no witness should be taken until all witnesses were in the court room, their excuse fell to the ground completely. Was the evidence of the right hon.

gentlemen, his associates, to be at all different whether Sir Hugh was on this side of the Atlantic or the other? The intention of the adjournment was perfectly clear, in order to gain time. The Oaths Bill was passed in such a shape as necessitated an instruction from the House before the Committee could proceed, when it might have been so framed that the Committee could have proceeded without that instruction. When the Committee met on the 2nd of July in Montreal, the Oaths Bill had been disallowed. It had been sent to England with all speed immediately after its passing through Parliament—in fact the very day it had passed. The disallowance was published in the *Official Gazette* upon the day the Committee met, before the rising of the House on the 23rd of May.

He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) put the question across the House to know what the intention of the Government was to be when they met on the 13th of August. The right hon. gentleman stated in reply, not as a message from the Crown (*hear, hear*), but simply in the ordinary form, that it was the intention to have the House prorogued on that day. (*Hear, hear, from Government benches.*) The hon. member for Châteauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton) reminded the right hon. gentleman that he might not be in a position to advise a prorogation on that occasion. He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) repeated that when the right hon. gentleman replied to the remarks of his hon. friend, he never said nor gave the House to understand that he was entrusted with a message from His Excellency, but simply said the adjournment was intended to take place on that day, nor did he say he had then advised prorogation. (*Loud applause.*)

He need not recall to memory the remarkable proceedings of that day. You had a little share in them, and so had I; and if I recollect rightly, I failed to get before the House the motion I intended to move. I had succeeded, to be sure, in having it placed in your hands, but it seemed it might as well have remained in my desk; but I remember another remarkable thing. I remember that you failed to make your appearances here at the hour you were ordered by Parliament to appear, and I remember seeing the Usher of the Black Rod at the door long before his Excellency reached the Senate Chamber. I recollect that you only succeeded in reaching this Chamber about the same time as His Excellency reached the other Chamber, and I recollect the instant that was announced the usher made his appearance here in order to summon the House to appear in the other Chamber. If the House had assembled at the proper time, I would have been able to get my motion before the House, and I look upon these extraordinary measures as an insult to this high court of Parliament. (*Loud cheers.*) This combination of circumstances showed that there was a collusion in order to prevent the free expression of opinion on the part of this House. (*Renewed cheers.*)

He would at another period discuss perhaps other matters relating to this subject. He was merely pointing out now the indecent usage that Parliament received at the hands of His Excellency’s advisers of that day. (*Cheers.*) What was the object in thus suddenly proroguing Parliament. So anxious were the Opposition that everything should be conducted fairly, that when they met on the evening of the 12th, he suggested to his friends that if the

Government asked for an adjournment on account of the absence of their supporters, that that adjournment should be granted without question, (*cheers*) though he believed Ministers were mainly instrumental in preventing attendance of the gentlemen here.

He had been told that some Ministerial supporters had been informed by the Ministers that they need not attend, but when it was remembered that the more representation of Manitoba was to the fore, that there was at least one member from distant Cape Breton, and eight from other parts of Nova Scotia, and that on the Opposition side only two men were absent; it would be seen that the understanding was that Parliament should assemble on that day.

He had no hesitation in saying what the duty of Parliament was at that time. It was to protect its Committee that had been appointed to investigate these charges, and to give that committee specific instructions under the changed circumstances, in order that the enquiry might proceed. The committee were not only deprived of this assistance, but of its existence.

Parliament was prorogued apparently for the express purpose of preventing it from proceeding with the investigation, and putting it in the hands of a Commission. Who were the charges against? Against the Ministers themselves. Parliament had appointed a Committee for investigation and they deliberately chose to advise His Excellency to allow them to appoint a Commission to try themselves.

He was not in possession of that legal knowledge that would enable him to pronounce a dogmatic opinion upon the powers of that commission; but, he was advised by, he believed, every constitutional writer and by all constitutional usage, that the Commission had really no power. We know that they never attempted to force a witness to attend (*hear, hear*) and doubtless they abstained from any attempt of that sort, simply because they knew they existed outside of the Constitution of the country. (*Cheers.*) Nothing could be more outrageous than thus first violently proroguing Parliament, thus taking the enquiry out of its hands, and then appointing a Commission to try the charges of which Parliament was seized. He had not attempted a careful critical analysis of the evidence presented. That would doubtless be done by other gentlemen; but he had simply to point out that the evidence disclosed showed, in the first place, that there was a determination to carry the elections at all hazards. He had no objection to a purely political contest, however fierce, but for the Government having the administration of the affairs of the country in hand, having a gigantic enterprise in charge, to use the contract for that enterprise for the purpose of foiling their opponents was unfair in the first place, looking at it simply as a political involvement, and it was without precedent in the history of this country.

We are at the present moment in the heat of a great crisis in the political history of this country. It was quite evident that our system was on its trial at the present moment. If this sort of work can be carried on with impunity by the administration of the day, then

Representative Government had practically failed in this country, (*hear, hear*) and if the Parliamentary system of government failed, what were we to substitute in its place? Did these gentlemen look at nothing but the retention of office by themselves? Was this to be the chief end of the Ministers in this country? He appealed to every man in this House to consider seriously the position in which these matters had placed us, and say by their votes on the motion he proposed to submit whether they were willing that this system should continue.

It was not necessary that he should at the present moment address any further remarks upon the subject. He had made good the statement with which he commenced his address, namely, in the first place, that the whole policy of the Government for the last two and a half years had been directed towards accomplishing a Parliamentary victory at the recent elections; that the refusal of an electoral law to provide for the greatest possible purity of elections; that their making a compact with British Columbia that this road should be built within ten years; that their using that as a lever for obtaining extraordinary powers from Parliament; and that their intrigues with a wealthy capitalist in order to obtain money to carry the elections, all merited the condemnation of this House.

He concluded by moving that the following words be added to the paragraph:—"And we have to acquaint His Excellency that by their course in reference to the investigation of the charges preferred by Mr. Huntington in his place in this House, and under the facts disclosed in the evidence laid before us, His Excellency's advisers have merited the severe censure of this House." (*Loud cheers.*)

The motion was seconded by Mr. Coffin.

It being six o'clock, the House rose for recess.

AFTER RECESS

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said he rejoiced that the time had come when his colleagues and himself were in a position to discuss this question in the presence of an independent Parliament and free people. The Government had been assailed as no Government in this, or he believed in any other country, had ever been assailed, and he entirely concurred in the sentiments enunciated by the hon. leader of the Opposition when he said that the decision of this question was one that was not simply to affect the Government of the country, but was to affect in the deepest and broadest sense the prosperity of Canada. (*Hear, hear.*) He believed that if ever there was a time that this Parliament was called on to deal with a question momentous in its results it was at the present hour. (*Hear, hear.*) He believed he should be able to show that not only had this Government been assailed in a manner that was unprecedented in history, but motives were behind that assault of a character that would not bear investigation. (*Hear, hear, and no, no.*)

When hon. gentlemen opposite had been unable, as they would be unable, to sustain in the slightest degree the false, and scandalous charges—(*cheers*)—which they had brought forward, it would be shown that lying behind them there were influences which they themselves would be ashamed to own. (*Derisive cheers from the Opposition.*) He had no hesitation in saying that there was no gentleman in this intelligent Chamber, after listening to the address of the leader of the Opposition, but felt as he did that this case had been abandoned at the outset. (*Cheers.*) He said that no intelligent man in the House or in the country could listen to or could read those charges as made by the hon. member for Sheffield (Hon. Mr. Huntington), and presented to the House, and listen to the address of the leader of the Opposition without feeling that in the outset they had abandoned their charges. (*Cheers.*) The hon. gentleman had spoken of the lengths to which the Government were prepared to go in order to secure the extension of their lease of power. Those who had watched the career of the hon. gentleman and those who sit behind him would, he believed, come to the conclusion that while the Government of the country had endeavoured to secure a lease of power by bringing forward such measures as they believed would advance the prosperity, raise the character, and elevate the position of Canada, they had been met by gentlemen opposite using efforts and adopting means in order to obtain the power which the Government possessed, such as he believed never would receive the sanction of a majority of the Parliament of Canada, or the approval of the people of this country.

The hon. gentleman had himself shown the length to which he and those associated with him were prepared to go to secure power. (*Hear, hear.*) He could well understand his suspecting the Government of using improper means to retain power when he knew the means upon which he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) was disposed to rely on in order to obtain possession of power. (*Hear, hear.*) The hon. gentleman had undertaken in advance to claim the support of a majority of this House. (*Opposition cheers.*) It was not the first time that members of this House and the people of this country had heard the hon. gentleman claim to have in his hand the possession of a majority (*cheers*), but it had turned out that the hon. gentleman had counted without his host, and he would tell him on the present occasion that it became him to boast who laid off armour, and not him who put it on. (*Cheers.*)

He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) declared there were evidences that the Government was losing the confidence of the country. He had pointed to the fact that in the Province of Ontario he had received a majority of supporters at the last general election. He (Hon. Mr. Tupper) granted it, but he asked them to look at the means by which that majority was obtained. Why did not the hon. gentleman tell the House of the issues that were put before the people of Ontario?

Why did he not tell the House the fact, which was patent to every intelligent man in the country, that when the parent state, the Mother Country, to which we owed so much, in her extremity, made an appeal to the Government and Parliament and people of this country to sanction her in the settlement of one of the most

important questions with which she was ever called to deal, was met with such a response from Canada as a loyal appeal from the Mother Country would always receive. (*Cheers.*) In the hour of England's extremity when there were important interests at stake, interests that touched the very connection of this country with the parent State, interests that involved, in the opinion of England, the security of the Canadian possessions; in that hour what did hon. gentlemen opposite do? They forgot what they owed to Canada and to the Mother Country. (*Hear, hear.*) They endeavoured to assist the government of the country in a manner such as the people of Canada had never approved and never would approve.

The Government were told now that they had sold the Canadian Pacific Railway charter for the means to carry the elections at the last general election. The Province of Ontario especially was made to resound with the declaration that they had sold the interests of Canada slavishly at the bidding of the parent State, and the hon. gentleman went throughout the length and breadth of this country issuing every disloyal sentiment towards Great Britain. (*Cheers and cries of no.*) Did the hon. gentlemen dispute this assertion? (*Yes.*) He would read the language of the leaders of the Opposition and of the hon. gentleman who had just addressed the House, to the hon. gentlemen who sat beside him, and he would leave it to the House and to the country to say whether he was sustained when he declared that there was no means that were not used by which the public sentiment of the people of Canada could be influenced against the Government, on the ground of their having bartered away the interests of the people of Canada at the bidding of the parent State.

At the Reform banquet in Toronto, when the platform of the Party was laid down previous to last session, Hon. Mr. Blake said the advisers of his Excellency had consented to the absolute cession of the sovereignty of the St. Lawrence to the United States. (*Hear, hear.*) Let him give the hon. gentleman's comment on that statement, and then let him say if he durst in this House, that he (Hon. Mr. Tupper) was not sustained in what he said, that no language was more calculated to excite sentiments of disloyalty to the Crown.

This was what the hon. gentleman said: "No greater stretch of the prerogative had occurred within the last quarter of a century; no greater insult to the Canadian people, and no greater violation of the principles of Colonial government, which had been so firmly established could be well conceived." Could the English language, he (Hon. Mr. Tupper) asked, provide the gentlemen with the means of further aspersing the Imperial Government? He would give them the remarks made on the same subject, and on the same occasion by the same member for Lambton. Hon. Mr. Mackenzie said his friend Hon. Mr. Blake and others of them took ground early after the treaty was concluded that their country was in danger, and that the treaty was a dishonourable one to England and to Canada. (*Opposition cheers.*) Now let hon. gentleman meet him with derisive cheers if they could when they had succeeded in obtaining a poor success in Ontario—for it was a poor success to obtain a small majority in one Province in hostility to the government which

was standing by British interest and British connection, and showing a desire to meet fully, and fairly and generously, and to reciprocate the obligations which we had incurred to the parent State. At that hour those hon. gentlemen felt it not unworthy in order to obtain a small advantage to sacrifice interests which the entire vote of the Province of Ontario would have been inadequate to compensate for. (*Cheers.*)

Believing, as he did, that the honour, the advancement, the material prosperity, the commercial status, the elevation of our common country in every sense of the words, depended on our indissoluble connection with the parent State, he said that he was an enemy to Canada and unworthy of the position of being the leader of public sentiment in Canada—(*cheers*)—who for the paltry object of obtaining power would use the influence and ability which God had given him for the purpose of endeavouring to degrade in the estimation of the people of this country, the sentiment of Great Britain towards ourselves, and as far as in him lay to loosen that tie, and weaken that attachment upon which depended the future glory and progress and prosperity of this country. (*Cheers.*)

That was not the only means by which the hon. gentleman obtained an advantage in Ontario. At the last election the hon. gentleman and his friends made Ontario resound with the cry that Canada was ruined by the efforts which the Government had made to secure the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They went from end to end of the Province with the declaration that the monstrous load of debt which the Government were laying upon the country, the inordinate consideration that they had offered to secure the construction of that road, would paralyse the energies of the country, and would ruin the prospects of Canada. They professed then on the other side of the House as they professed now, that they were in favour of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He asked them to look at the facts as they stood today when all the means provided by the Government of Canada and sanctioned by this Parliament had proved utterly inadequate to secure the building of the road which they declared was a necessity, and one Canada was bound to provide for. He asked them if they had any reason to congratulate themselves upon the poor success which had attended their attempt to undermine the Government in the confidence of the people.

Beyond that there was a means, not less unworthy than those he had already alluded to, resorted to with the greatest possible amount of success. These hon. gentlemen, and the press supporting them, had used as a great lever by which they could move the public pulse of the people of Ontario the declaration that the Government was sacrificing the interests and the rights of the people of Ontario to the advantage of the smaller Provinces. (*Opposition cheers.*) These gentlemen had gone through Ontario declaring that it was necessary for the people of that Province to combine in self-defence; denouncing the Government for the concessions by which a great and important Province had been conciliated; denouncing the terms given to Manitoba (*hear, hear*), and to British Columbia (*hear, hear*), using the sentiment that the member for Norfolk North (Mr. Charlton) gave utterance to that the ten members for Manitoba

and British Columbia were bogus members, and indignantly enquiring if the Government of the country was to be controlled and carried on by men who had no rights as against the great Province of Ontario. It was by means such as these from which high-minded and honourable statesmen would shrink (*cheers*), that hon. gentlemen opposite secured a majority in the Province of Ontario, but after all their effort they had not as many men pledged to sustain them as would give them the control of the House. And yet the hon. gentleman congratulated himself on his position.

He had thought it necessary to allude to the late Government of Ontario in terms that he left to the hon. gentleman's able colleague, the member for Durham West (Hon. Mr. Wood) to answer. (*Cheers and laughter.*) At the last election, however, the present Government of Ontario not only gave its moral support to the hon. gentlemen opposite, but used means such as no honourable-minded set of men would have used. But the result showed that the people of Ontario were sound at heart, and a large portion, if not a majority of that people, were prepared to sustain the Government who were carrying on fairly and honestly the business of the country. (*Hear, hear.*)

The hon. gentleman had said that this system of government was on its trial. Before he sat down he would show why he believed that statement to be well founded, and he would give his reasons for believing that the trial would be short, and that the execution would soon fall. (*Cheers.*) When Parliament met and those gentlemen found themselves, notwithstanding their boasts, in a minority, they did not hesitate to use in this House the same means as they had used in the country. Every question in relation to the Washington Treaty that could excite and disturb the public mind, and as far as possible prevent the results which they had every reason to anticipate would flow from that Treaty, was brought up. Every motion made by hon. gentlemen which was brought to a vote, was voted down, and they found that as the country had ratified the conduct of the Government, so the House was prepared to sustain that action, and those empty boasts ended, as he believed this effort of the hon. gentlemen would end, in leaving them a very decided minority. (*Hear, hear.*) When every other effort had failed, these hon. gentlemen felt it not unworthy of the position they occupied as a constitutional Opposition, to bring forward charges which, at the very hour they were made, there was historical evidence to prove utterly baseless and without foundation. (*No, no, from the Opposition.*)

The member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) had charged the Government not only with bartering a great public contract to secure money for the elections, but with bartering it to foreigners and to a rival company, the Northern Pacific Railway Company.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: That is not the charge.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said he would read the *ipsissima verba* of the charges, to show that what he had stated was correct. He then, amid great interruption from the Opposition, read the charges. If they were anxious to hear the motion they would be rather quieter.

(*Hear, hear.*) The charge made by the hon. gentlemen was that the Government were aware that negotiations were going on between Sir Hugh Allan and his American friends. He asked the House whether his position on this motion is not triumphant. Now let the hon. gentlemen retract the story. The hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) in his speech, had not dared to take the position that the Government of the country had sold the contract for the gold of foreigners. The position that he (Hon. Mr. Tupper) occupied was one that spoke for itself. The mere declaration of the hon. member for Shefford had been met as it had been made, by a mere denial. The historical facts, as they existed in that day, were in themselves abundant proof to show that the charge was false.

The facts were that the Government had refused to give the contract to any person connected with the Americans. The fact was that the power of the Jay Cooke Company was bound up with hon. gentlemen opposite, to try and overthrow the Government, when that Company found it could not get the contract. The historical facts were such as to show every intelligent man in this country that there was not a shadow of truth in the charge, and that hon. gentlemen opposite knew that such was the case. That charge, made in the presence of the House, became public property. The wings of the country carried it throughout the length and breadth of the civilized world, and he asked if that was not sufficient reason to insure his friend, the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues, to take the course that they had taken. Was it not undignified of the hon. member for Shefford to make a charge calculated to leave a stain not only upon the Government but on the country itself.

He (Hon. Mr. Tupper) had no hesitation in saying that from the evidence taken before the Commission and now before the House, there was not a shadow of reason for such a charge. An injury had been inflicted upon the fair name of Canada which hon. gentlemen opposite if they had power for twenty years would be unable to efface. Before the charge had been preferred the people of England were with one accord loud in their praise of the exalted position of the Parliament of Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite might congratulate themselves that they had removed this by the skilful use of language which they now wished to withdraw, as calculated to prejudice the character and position of Canada to an extent which was not easily repaired.

The Government had asked for a Committee because they felt it was due to the honour of the country that the charges should be submitted to the fullest investigation. When the Committee was appointed the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Joly) moved that the testimony should be taken under oath. The House felt at once that the proposal of that hon. gentleman was a wise and just proposal. It was felt that it would be in the last degree improper for any man to come before the Committee and make statements which, under the solemn responsibility of an oath, he would not dare to make. What was the case? The Premier said to the hon. member for Lotbinière that he need not press his motion; that he (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) would pledge himself that the evidence would be taken on oath. What happened? Every person knew that the Premier expressed doubts as to the constitutionality of the Oaths Bill, but at

the same time he was so anxious that this investigation should be taken speedily and under oath, that he pledged himself that the Government would, in case of disallowance of the Oaths Bill, confer powers of a Royal Commission upon the Committee and the difficulty would be removed.

The Government had been charged with delay because Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald had claimed that in the absence of two hon. members of the House, it would be a foul wrong to those gentlemen that the charges which touched their characters as public men should be dealt with. Hon. gentlemen had been anxious to press an unfair advantage on those hon. gentlemen in their absence. They had retracted as they had before, and the House decided that it was wise that the Committee should adjourn their investigation until the arrival of Sir George-É. Cartier and Mr. Abbott (Argenteuil). Parliament had decided in the first place that there should be an investigation; in the second that the investigation should take place under oath, and that in the third place no discussion of this question should take place in Parliament until Parliament had that inquiry before it.

The House would remember how Hon. Mr. Huntington tried to bring evidence before it when the matter was in the hands of the Commission, and that the Speaker had ruled that the hon. gentleman could not do so. The House had acquiesced in that decision, and no hon. gentleman had taken the responsibility to appeal to the House against such a decision. That was not all. In order to keep the Commission alive an adjournment of the House was resolved on, and in giving a reason for that adjournment he must differ from the hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie).

Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald proposed that the House should adjourn to a particular day, for the purpose of enabling the Committee to meet during recess. He was asked what would be done on the 13th August, and the reply was that the House would meet *pro forma* to receive the report of the Commission, and that it would then be prorogued. The hon. member for Lambton had said this reply had not been given as coming from his Excellency. The hon. gentleman knew quite well that nobody would lay any weight to that statement of his (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's). It was well known that the Premier would not speak in any other way than he was authorized by the Crown. (*Applause.*) He would go further and say, that when that announcement was made, it was quite true that the hon. member for Châteauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton) had said, "perhaps you will not be in a position to advise on the 13th August", but that could only have happened by the resignation of the Ministry. He maintained that when the announcement was made that the meeting in August would only be *pro forma*, it became a solemn compact between the Crown and the Parliament, that on certain day certain things should take place. (*Applause.*) When hon. gentlemen dispersed far and wide, the position of the Crown would have been compromised by falling from that compact, and permitting this House to proceed with business in the absence of a single member.

He wanted to know what hon. gentlemen opposite would have said if the Government had said to their supporters—"Be in your places; we have pledged ourselves to the House, but we wish to steal a march on the Opposition," and had then passed a resolution condemning this whole matter. He believed that hon. gentleman opposite would have denounced the Government for having broken a solemn compact with Parliament. Well, on the 2nd of July the gentlemen composing this tribunal met in Montreal pursuant to adjournment. For a long time hon. gentlemen opposite circulated through the length and breadth of the land statements which the hon. member for Lambton had referred to in his speech, to the effect that the Government of Canada had sent a special agent to England to procure the disallowance of the Oaths Bill. But this statement had been destroyed by evidence which no man dare to gainsay, when it was found that the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had sent the strongest despatch that man could send to the Imperial Government, urging the reasons why they should assent to the Oaths Bill. Gentlemen opposite had made charges against the Government, for the purpose of affecting public sentiment in the country.

On the 2nd July the Committee met in Montreal, when they were met by the Government with the only means by which they could proceed to discharge the high and important duties which had been entrusted to them by this Parliament. They were tendered a Royal Commission. That would have enabled them there and then where all, or almost all, the witnesses were present in Montreal—(*cheers*)—to have gone on. The Government removed the only difficulty created by the disallowance of the Oaths Bill, and took it out of the way. (*Cheers.*) On this point he would only say that he did not place quite so implicit confidence in the opinion of the hon. member of Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) on questions of Constitutional laws, as his high position at the Bar of Ontario would seem to justify. As a lawyer, he would place implicit confidence in any opinion of the hon. gentleman when a Party question was not involved; but he must confess that when the hon. gentleman looked at these questions through Party spectacles, his vision was a little clouded. (*Laughter.*) He then related several instances in which the Party bias of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blake) had led him to give opinions which had been controverted by the Law Officers of the Crown, notably the question of the Nova Scotia better terms and the appointment of Queen's Counsel, and on all of which cases the Premier had been right. And so when the hon. gentleman ventured to state that there could be no doubt as to the constitutionality of the Oaths Bill in the face of the fact that the Confederation Act declared that the Parliament of Canada should have such power and privileges as were possessed by Imperial Parliament at the time of the passing of that Act, and no others; that the Imperial Parliament did not at that time possess the power proposed to be taken by the Act.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said he had not been present at the discussion on this measure.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER: Would the hon. gentleman deny that he had lent the weight of his authority to the Oaths Bill?

Hon. Mr. BLAKE would repeat what he had already said.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER was glad that the hon. gentleman had qualified his statement, for he was sure there had never been any greater insult to this country than the line his Party had taken on this question. The country had been convulsed by the statements which had been circulated in respect to the Oaths bill, and if the hon. gentleman did not approve of this line then public deception in this country had gone further than he thought it possible for it to go.

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON: The hon. member for Cardwell (Hon. Mr. Cameron) gave the same opinion.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER: When he showed that instead of being desirous of promoting the inquiry the hon. members for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) and Napierville (Hon. Mr. Dorion) had refused to avail themselves of the means which the Crown had provided to give effect to the unanimous vote of the House, hon. gentleman must not be surprised if the country failed to put much faith in their professions. He asked them if they would be surprised if, when the people of the country saw that, on a mere question of form, these gentlemen refused to perform a duty which they professed they were anxious to proceed with; and when they were anxious to proceed with a course which had met with the universal reprobation of every authority, worthy of consideration—for it was decided by the House that the evidence should be taken under oath—when therefore he proposed that they should proceed to take evidence without the sanction of an oath, he asked them if they would be surprised when he proposed to take such a course if the people of the country met them with distrust? The Government of the country were anxious to be arraigned before a fair and independent tribunal, and to answer upon their oaths every question that could be asked of them.

But if the matter were followed down to its legitimate results, it would be found that the gentleman opposite discovered that they had reckoned without their host, and that they had in reality no case; and as every other means had failed them, so this disreputable attempt to break down the credit of the country and the honour of the Administration failed them, and left them without having attained the power which they coveted so much. (*Cheers.*)

He thought that the hon. member for Lambton would be disposed to bury with the past their transactions of the day of prorogation. He thought that the hon. gentleman would like it to have been forgotten that he had rallied his Party from one end of the country by influences which he (Hon. Mr. Tupper) would be ashamed to name on the floor of the House. (*Opposition laughter.*) The *Globe* newspaper published a statement that members could claim their travelling expenses for coming here on that day, thus suggesting that members could only be induced to come here on the payment of their travelling expenses. He repeated, by means which he refused to name, the hon. member succeeded in bringing a large number of his followers to Ottawa on that day, and this notwithstanding the solemn declaration that had been made, and the compact that had been arrived at, that no business would be done on that day.

But there was another reason why the hon. member for Lambton should wish that the recollection of that day should be lost in the shades of oblivion. He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) claimed to be the leader of Liberalism and Reform in this country, and were they to be told that after thirty years struggle for Constitutional Government and after safeguards had been made against back door influences one so far forgot his rule as the leader of Liberalism and Reform, as to get up a round robin for the purpose of compelling the Queen's representative to accept the dictation of an irresponsible minority, acting outside of this House, and without free discussion on the floor of Parliament, and without the forms of Parliamentary Government as known throughout the world? If there was a man who should wish this buried it was the hon. member for Lambton, for it showed that all his profession of Liberalism and Reform were merely made for the purpose of creating an impression in the country; but that when the principles of Liberalism and Reform stood in the way, they should be trampled under foot as utterly unworthy of a great Liberal and Reform statesman who desired to attain to an immediate accession to power. (*Cheers.*)

He was not surprised that gentlemen not so well acquainted with public life should have been misled; that those who had not had such means of arriving at a correct understanding of great constitutional questions as the hon. member had had should have lent themselves for a moment to this, which on the surface had an air of plausibility. He was sure that the sober second thought of these gentlemen would tell them that if discussion on the floor of Parliament were taken away, then the whole great principle of Government, by majorities, was swept away.

Now, as to the question of the constitutionality of the Royal Commission—he supposed the hon. member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) would scarcely again deny that on that nice important question he was again at issue with the great fountain of Constitutional Law, the Imperial law officers of the Crown.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE was not aware of it.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER would tell the hon. gentleman that if he did not know it, evidence of the fact would be submitted to the House at an early day; and thus in every instance the hon. gentleman found himself in error when his opinions were submitted to the crucial test of the highest authority known to the British Empire. (*Derisive Opposition cheers.*)

The hon. gentlemen uttered derisive cheers. He would tell hon. gentlemen that through the civilized world, wherever Constitutional Government was known, British Constitutional authority was looked up to and respected by men of all classes and parties. The hon. gentleman might bring into contempt the action of the Imperial Government, as he had done in respect to the Treaty, but that would not carry conviction to the country. (*Cheers.*) But it was not the mere question of constitutional authority that was raised. That matter, he took it, had been settled in a manner that was satisfactory to the House and to the country, despite all that could be said. To the Commission itself it had been objected that it was a partisan

Commission. The Commission had been denounced by hon. gentlemen and by their press as unworthy of the confidence of the country.

He asked the hon. gentleman on what grounds he undertook to prove that a partisan Commission appointed by Parliament, and with power to take evidence under oath, was better than an independent commission of Judges of the land. Did the hon. gentleman forget, when discussing the Election Law, he used language so extreme that he (Hon. Mr. Tupper) scarcely dared to quote it in the House? It must be borne in mind that this language was not made use of in reference to an unsworn tribunal, not in reference to a partisan Commission such as the Pacific investigation Commission was. (*Hear, hear, and laughter.*) The hon. gentleman would not question his statement when he said that it was possible to obtain a partisan Commission in this House; that Commission was the one under discussion. He was sure that he would admit that they might search the House to find greater partisans than himself (Hon. Mr. Blake) and the hon. member for Napierville (Hon. Mr. Dorion), and the gentleman from the other side of the House were equally partisans in their proclivities. The Committee was struck under the Grenville Act, under all the safeguards which the Imperial Parliament could devise for its fairness and impartiality.

He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) then spoke of the tribunal as a wretched Party Commission. Now he wanted to know by what course of reasoning the hon. gentleman arrived at the conclusion that the Committee was not appointed with the safe-guards which were provided in other cases, and why was it better than a Committee of Judges?

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said that in the Parliamentary Committee there were three partisans from one side, and two from the other, whereas on the Commission there were three partisans all of one side. (*Cheers and laughter.*)

Hon. Mr. TUPPER continued, saying that it would have been impossible for the Government to have obtained the services of higher judicial authorities in the land than the Commons, and so much was it the fact that even the Opposition press of the country had spoken with bated breath about the Commission, knowing that throughout the country they were regarded as honourable, impartial, and high minded men. (*Cheers.*) When the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) was invited to appear before the Commission and make out his cause, he stayed away, knowing that it would not bear investigation before such a tribunal, and further, he said that the statement which had been made by the hon. member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) in respect to the Commissioners would not be borne out elsewhere, and that it would have been impossible for the Commissioners discharging their duties in the face of the public, and subject to the keen criticism of the Opposition press, to have discharged them in any other way than in the impartial and high minded manner in which they did. (*Loud cheers.*)

But this Commission had been contrasted with a Commission appointed under the Grenville Act. A Commission of this House

had been declared to be incompetent to deal with the interests of a single constituency, but at the same time the hon. member for Bruce South had endeavoured to get the character, the honour of the Government of the Country, tried before a Parliamentary Committee, which could not take evidence under oath. (*Hear, hear.*) He had said before that when hon. gentleman took this course they gave the strongest evidence that it was possible for men to give that they had no confidence in their cause, and that their case could not stand the test of evidence taken under oath. (*Cheers.*)

When he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) was compelled to abandon the gravamen of his charge, when he had to abandon the charge that the Pacific Railway charter was sold to Sir Hugh Allan, when he abandoned the charge of foreign aid, which necessarily he must have done, and when he undertook to sustain this by a shadow of testimony—and to do this he did what, as a reasonable member of this House, he (Hon. Mr. Tupper) was surprised to find him do—read private letters which Sir Hugh Allan had sworn were incorrect—he gave up the case, and it was scarcely necessary to answer him. (*Cheers.*) Apart from all other matters, he (Hon. Mr. Tupper) contended that the Government were entitled to a Commission, because of the course which the Opposition had taken. After the adjournment of the Committee, they had taken the matter out of the hands of that body, and had placed the evidence before the country.

But these gentlemen, who were so anxious that the trial of controverted elections should be taken from the wretched Committees of this House, and be adjudicated upon by judges, considered this Commission a partisan Commission. He would like to know if the hon. gentleman required that the tribunal of judges for the trial of controverted elections should have two sides. He desired to know whether no confidence could be placed in this judge, or that, because he had been put on the bench by one said or the other. He (Hon. Mr. Tupper) knew that when the hon. gentleman made such an insinuation as this he made an insinuation which the conduct of the judges of this country would not justify, and yet the hon. gentleman had ventured to make such an insinuation. Now, he would like to know the answer the hon. gentleman had to give. It was known that the hon. member for Shefford invoked the aid of the Crown, and undertook to advise the Crown to the prejudice of the head of the Government. This attempt to trample under foot the principles of liberalism and reform in this country was met by her Majesty's representative in a manner which showed that constitutional Government was understood in England, and that those who were sent here to discharge the functions of the Crown would discharge them in a constitutional manner.

He now came to the question of the evidence before the Royal Commission. The House would readily understand when they saw the leader of the Opposition, in order to make out a case and to give it a semblance of consistency, read from a private letter, which the sworn testimony of Sir Hugh Allan declared to be incorrect, that there was not a shadow of authority for the statement which the hon. member for Lambton had made. He (Hon. Mr. Tupper) would like to know how the hon. member for Lambton, when he knew that

every means was used by the Opposition to prevent sworn testimony, and when he knew that sworn testimony had been obtained, had undertaken to prove by the unsworn testimony of a private letter, in what position he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) stood, and how he expected members of this House to place the slightest confidence in the case which he had undertaken to establish. (*Cheers.*) The fact was when the evidence came to be taken before a competent tribunal it was found that the whole case of the Opposition had melted away.

He would like to ask the hon. member for Shefford what would be thought of it at the Bar, of which he (Hon. Mr. Huntington) was a distinguished member, if he did in an ordinary suit at law what he had done in this case. If he were trying a property case and were to put down a list of witnesses by whom he expected to prove certain facts connected with the case, and who after the solemn ordeal of an oath, every one of these witnesses were to solemnly affirm that they were unable to prove that which he had declared them able to prove, what would be the consequences? He would like to know how he felt sitting opposite the hon. member for Vancouver (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks), whom he had declared could prove his whole case, and had disproved it. He would like to know in what position the hon. member stood when he found that every one of his witnesses had come forward and declared that they could not prove what he had said they could prove, but had proved the very reverse. He did not wonder that the hon. member shrunk from coming before that commission himself. He did not wonder that when he found that he did not appear face to face before any independent judicial tribunal, and in the face of those witnesses who received, when they met him in the street and asked him what they expected them to prove, the reply was "I really don't know."

He (Hon. Mr. Tupper) would not take up the time of the House by going into the case and proving that the hon. gentleman had been fishing for testimony; that the hon. gentleman had handed himself over to American influence, for which it was known he had always had a strong *penchant*, and aided the very American influence which the Government had thrust out. The House knew too well the circumstances which led to this contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway to render it necessary for him to occupy their time in detailing. They knew, whether wisely or unwisely, that the Government had contracted with the Province of British Columbia that this great back bone of the British North American Provinces should be constructed; they knew that British Columbia held the view that in order to make the union anything but a union on paper it was necessary that this great line of railway should be constructed, and that the Parliament of the country had pledged itself that the work should be undertaken and carried to a completion.

The hon. gentleman then detailed the circumstances attending the inception of the scheme, and of the introduction of the bills to the House. The whole question had been argued exhaustively, and this House had decided to give them all the powers they asked. They were not only not abused, but were not sufficient to secure the construction of the road. It had been said that a corrupt bargain had

been made with Sir Hugh Allan; but where was the *quid pro quo*? What advantage had Sir Hugh obtained? When he came to ask for the contract if we wished to make a corrupt bargain all we had to do was to issue a proclamation, giving him the contract; but we refused on the grounds of his American connection. We said, "If you will make it a broad Canadian Company, or amalgamate with the Interoceanic Company, we will give it to you." This Company having refused to coalesce with Sir Hugh Allan's we refused to give him the charter. Until the charge of corruption was proved before the tribunal of the House it was to be treated as idle wind.

It was unfortunately the case that we have not in this country the machinery for elections which existed in England. Here we had no Carlton Club. Money was spent, but no member of this House had been able even to say that any of it had been used for a corrupt purpose, and amongst the whole constituencies the amount was infinitesimal. The expenditure of money in elections was not confined to the Liberal or the Conservative Party in Canada. It was thoroughly understood in England, and members on the floor of the House of Commons there had frankly confessed the use of it. The people of this country were not to be led by hypocrisy.

The assertion that foreign gold had been used in elections had not been proved. The charge had been made against Sir George-É. Cartier, in whom Canada had lost one of her most distinguished patriots and high-minded men, who had devoted his life to reconciling the conflicting elements in the country, in which he succeeded to a remarkable degree. The subscription that Sir Hugh Allan gave, considering his means, was less than fifty Reform gentlemen had subscribed to the late elections. At the time he subscribed, Sir Hugh was engaged in a war to the death with the powerful interest of the Grand Trunk. He had taken up the Northern Colonization line to use from Montreal to Toronto, as well as other lines which made the carrying out of the Pacific Railway contract, no matter by whom made, a matter of vital importance to Sir Hugh Allan. His subscription of \$162,000, considering the interests he had at stake, rendered it a mere bagatelle compared with his means or the interest he had at stake. It was said the Government had given him the Pacific charter. A more unfounded statement could not be made. He was told he could not have it. He was only allowed to be one of thirteen directors selected from the whole country. He was allowed to subscribe one thirteenth of stock, and then under an obligation to surrender that to any who might subscribe, except a hundred thousand dollars, which each was allowed to retain.

The position Sir Hugh Allan had gained for himself pointed to him as the President of the company, but we gave him no more than we gave the twelve other gentlemen who were associated with him, none of whom could assign one dollar of the stock; and to show that he was surrounded by an independent board on the very first vote after its formation, a question to which Sir Hugh Allan attached great importance was voted down by them.

He (Hon. Mr. Tupper) then went through the list of directors of the late Canadian Pacific Railway, each of whom had received as much as Sir Hugh Allan, in fact he had not received as much as each one of the others. With regard to Nova Scotia he could say that

not one cent of money was ever spent there, except what was raised within the Province, and even after he had gone up to Ontario, and after all the elections were over he never knew that Sir Hugh had subscribed one dollar. Had he ever believed that the charge of the Opposition was in any one respect true he would have at once retired from the Ministry. (*Loud cheers.*) He knew from Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald's character that the charge was utterly false and baseless. (*Loud cheers.*) It was when the Opposition were inflaming the minds of the people of Ontario against England, when, he said, that the Ontario Ministry was using its utmost efforts and availing themselves of the most unscrupulous means to back the Opposition that his right hon. colleague asked his friends to come to the rescue. (*Loud cheers.*)

The Government of Nova Scotia had given the franchise to those who would vote in their interests and had refused it to those who would not do so, and the Canadian Government had done away with that injustice. The Canadian Government had pledged itself to construct a railway to British Columbia, and were met with obstruction in every stage by the Opposition. The question with gentlemen opposite was whether the right hon. gentleman should be struck down in his place. Was he right or wrong in saying that hon. gentlemen opposite built up their great Party on a narrow sectarian basis? If the country was prosperous it was because the policy of Sir John had succeeded in opposition to that of hon. gentlemen opposite.

He would ask those who looked at British America as it was before and as it was today what the country owed Sir John when hon. gentlemen opposite fell back from their position, and imperilled the great cause of Confederation, and when Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald stood firm in his course? When the Province of Nova Scotia complained that she had not been fairly dealt with, and the right hon. gentleman came down with a new scheme which had the result of making Nova Scotia contented, it was opposed by gentlemen opposite, who united themselves with gentlemen who declared that they would never rest until they broke up the Province, and united it with the United States. They denounced the terms given to Manitoba as unjust. They denounced the Government as having given undue political privileges to the Maritime Provinces. It would be remembered that the Government had been denounced for offering to Prince Edward Island the terms on which they had now come into the Dominion. If the Government had brought in these outlying Provinces, and if the condition and prosperity of the country had been such as to inspire praise it was because the policy of the Premier had been carried out in opposition to those opposite.

He hardly agreed with the member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) that the issue of this question was brought in the deepest interest of the prosperity of Canada. He would ask the House if there was not reason to fear that foreign influence was at work on the other side of the House. The Government had been charged with wishing to put into the hands of the Northern Pacific Railway the Canadian Pacific. If that was not the charge there was no charge at all. Everybody knew that Jay Cooke & Co. were the

sole inspiration of the investment, and nobody knew better than the member for Shefford that those gentlemen were determined at every sacrifice to obtain the control of this great Canadian enterprise.

When this Parliament had passed a law under which the work should be constructed by Canadian and English capital and should traverse Canadian soil and when the Government had been approached by these gentlemen with a view of obtaining the contract of the work, what took place? They were told that on no account could they have the contract; and yet the hon. member for Montreal, who had openly avowed the principle that the best interests of Canada and of England alike would be served by separation—he would read a resolution which that gentleman had in Montreal announced on the 17th June, 1870, and the resolution had been met with hisses:—“It was acknowledged by all that the union of Canada with the Mother Country had given Canada advantage, but it was no less the truth that the time had come when the connection with the Mother Country was a material cause of difficulty—(*cries of no*)—a burden to the parent State, and a clog to the Colony, and that British America should assume a national position.”

Hon. Mr. YOUNG (Montreal West) enquired what date that was?

Hon. Mr. TUPPER: June 1870.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG (Montreal West) stated he was not then member for Montreal West.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER could only say that the hon. gentleman was not at that time the member for Montreal West, but he was not aware that Mr. Young had retracted these sentiments.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG (Montreal West): Not in the least.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER: Then the hon. gentleman avows that these are his sentiments—that the time had come when Canada was a burden to the Mother Country, and when it should sever connection with the parent State. He might be told that these were not the sentiments of the hon. member for Lambton, and he (Hon. Mr. Tupper) might say that many gentlemen opposite were as loyal to the Crown as he was himself. He was, however, going to draw the attention of the House to the position of gentlemen opposite.

He would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) had congratulated the House last session upon the acquisition of the member for Montreal West (Hon. Mr. Young), and had stated he would rather have him there than the hon. member for Vancouver Island (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks), than whom there was no man more loyal to Britain. But that was not all. The member for Montreal West, since his election for the House, had been true to those sentiments, and had desired to place this country in the hands of the Americans for he undoubtedly meant annexation. He (Hon. Mr. Tupper) felt that the destiny of Canada was under the destiny of

the Mother Country, and it was Canada's duty to meet the desire of that country. The greatest misfortune that could happen to Canada would be to place her in a position that would involve her in the vortex of Republicanism. He looked with apprehension upon every desire for severing this country from the Mother Country.

After the Government and Parliament of Canada had decided that the Pacific Railway should be built, and that it should be built on Canadian soil, the member for Montreal West submitted to the Board of Trade an elaborate paper, for the purpose of getting that act of the Canadian Parliament reconsidered, setting forth in that paper that the route proposed by him was shorter; and what he (Hon. Mr. Tupper) complained of was, that when the fact that the route proposed by Mr. Young was pointed out to him as 260 miles further, by the engineer of the Pacific, he had not taken any means to correct his statements; and when he found that the hon. member for the North-west was unable to pass this resolution at the Board of Trade, the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington), an avowed Annexationist, came to his rescue, pledged to the interest of the very men to whom the Government of Canada had refused to give the Pacific contract, he had come to the conclusion that there was reason to fear that there were influences at work among the gentlemen opposite to substitute the interests and prosperity of the United States for those of Canada. He admitted that there were Grits opposite who were undoubtedly loyal, but he knew, at the same time, “that evil communications corrupt good manners.” The hon. member for Lambton had trampled on his precedents for the purpose of trying to occupy a seat on the treasury benches of this country. What position would that hon. gentleman be in with the hon. member for Montreal West, who wished to sever Canada from the Mother country, one side, and the hon. member for Shefford, an avowed Annexationist, on the other, and with the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macdonald), whom he would distrust as much as the others, because he had said that confederation had proved a failure? The hon. member had only got to disallow one more fact, and that was intercoalition, and he would have trampled on all his former sentiments.

He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) said that coalition was corruption. He wanted to know whether it would be a coalition or not with the hon. member for Shefford, and Montreal West and the hon. member for Glasgow. Having exhausted all the other means of obtaining power, and having scandalous and malicious invention sent to the winds, having done all that man could to gain a majority in the country, and having failed, he knew that there was no means by which he could obtain power except by trampling under foot anti-coalition. He stood ready to say to these gentlemen, come over and he would join them. He regarded the act of gentlemen opposite as a stain upon the country, which would bring the names of their children into contempt.

He called the attention of the House to the fact that the leader of the Opposition held only one public meeting in Nova Scotia during his recent visit to the seaside. That meeting was held in New Glasgow. The chairman and secretary were avowed annexationists, and the utterances of the hon. gentleman were to the last degree

opposed to that public sentiment which favours connection with the empire. (*Loud cheers.*) He called attention to the fact that the country in all the elections that had taken place since the first publication of the Slander had favoured the Government. Two elections had been held in Nova Scotia. In Antigonish the Hon. Mr. McDonald had been re-elected by acclamation, while in Hants the electors had coalesced in favour of a Government supporter. In the recent local election in Montreal a friend of the Government had been elected, although the hon. member for Châteauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton) had declared that to elect him would be to condone the Pacific Slander. (*Loud cheers.*) He referred also to the elections in South Ontario and Huron South, in which the electors had unmistakably declared for the Government, and moreover, in Laval County, a gentleman (Mr. Ouimet) whom the *Globe* said could never be elected, had this day been returned by a majority of over 700. (*Loud cheers.*) After summing up the various points of the case, the hon. gentlemen concluded amid immense cheering, having spoken nearly four hours.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) then moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GOUDGE said he wished to say a word in reference to the remark by the last speaker with reference to his professions before the people. He might say that the Pacific Scandal charges were so enormous that it was not easy to believe them, but he stated repeatedly from the first that if there was any truth in the charges, he would not support the Government.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: It seems to be forgotten that the subject we should deal with is not the subject of the elections, but it is a great question which all parties admit is of greater consequence than any election. A question which this special Parliament has been summoned to consider, and which this country, and the nations regarding this country, expect to see dealt with in an intelligent, and above all, honest manner. (*Cheers.*)

I listened to the long speech of the hon. gentleman tonight with a sense of sympathy, in which his friends must also join, while this great question was before the House, as to whether the Prime Minister of this country, wishing money, met a great public contractor who wished for the contract, whether the one got the money and the other the contract; while this great question, which has convulsed the country, and startled the world, was under consideration, that the Government should put forth a man who spoke but lightly of the great question, and wonders over everything which has ever been written, from the Genesis to the Revelations, of the politics of this country, is a mystery.

What matters it to me whether the leader of the Opposition is illogical and absurd, and unworthy of confidence as the hon. member for Cumberland (Hon. Mr. Tupper) had represented him to be, what matters it to me and to the country whether the member for Montreal West (Hon. Mr. Young) is as vile politically as the hon. gentleman has asserted, what matters whether the member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) is not in the opinion of the hon.

member for Cumberland a sound constitutional lawyer. We want to know, and the country wants to know the temper in which parliament is to deal with this great question (*cheers*), for I have nothing to say as to the person in question. I am quite independent of the opinion of the hon. gentleman may entertain towards me, and I did not enter upon this charge without knowing on the one hand that I was quite independent of any vengeance that could be wreaked upon me, and without being determined on the other to sorrowfully seek to wipe out this national disgrace, and I am not to be dragged now, into a discussion of all the collateral issues that may grow out of this subject, and all the matters relating to our ordinary politics. There is an old proverb that says it is dangerous to allow a thief to attract your attention while he robs you (*Great laughter*), and I will not allow the attempt to succeed, which had been made to divert public attention from the great enquiry which we are called here to consider. (*Cheers.*)

For years the leader of the Government (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) was never in a close place that he did not display great tact in getting out of it, and always when he came to the last possible opportunity of defending himself we had a tirade something like that which we got tonight, and it always roused more cheers and more enthusiasm than that which the hon. gentleman has been able to call forth upon this occasion. The sweet and lovely disposition which the hon. gentleman displayed in his speech was most delightful. (*Laughter.*) Why, there has been nothing like it since "Mary had a little lamb, with fleece as white as snow,"—hon. gentleman know the rest. (*Great laughter.*)

I will not attempt to follow his discourse. If he had made his followers believe that he was innocent, if he diverted their attention from the real issue, still the sad fact exists, and the duty of this House to deal with the question still remains. There was no justification in the hon. gentlemen's long speech, which could only have served the purpose to which I have alluded; nor yet was there any justification for the spirit in which he commenced the attack made upon me, when he said that I had made the charges while I knew that they were untrue, was altogether unjustifiable, as even His Excellency had stated in his despatch that I was justified in making these charges on account of the information in my possession.

Again, the hon. gentleman said, or rather, so far as he could insinuate that which he dare not say openly, that I am the paid servant of Jay Cooke. He said Jay Cooke was behind me, and that he was to give proof of that fact. I therefore expected an affidavit. The *Mail* and the *Ottawa Times* have made statements to that effect, for these papers have apparently been instructed to start the story, with a view of diverting public attention from the real question. I wonder if the hon. gentlemen will stand up in his place, and make that charge upon his responsibility as a member of Parliament. (*Hear, hear.*) I have not seen Jay Cooke for four years, and the charge is utterly and entirely false. (*Cheers.*) I was not induced by any American to profer the charges I made in this House. I did not obtain the information upon which I preceded from any of those

men, from Jay Cooke or General Cass, or any of the gentlemen connected with the Northern Pacific Railway.

On the contrary, after I stood pledged before this House and country to make good those charges, after the fearful investigation to which I was subjected by the right hon. gentleman opposite, the Prime Minister, the Northern Pacific Company turned their backs upon me, and would not even talk to me about the subject. I went to the office of the Northern Pacific Railway Company, although it was certainly upon other business; but I entered it with the hope that I might get some information upon the subject. I was not, however, allowed to remain in the office without witnesses being present, such was the anxiety to avoid the very suspicion of having given me any assistance. (*Hear, hear.*)

The charge that I have been in any way connected with the Northern Pacific people in regard either to the evidence obtained or the prosecution is without the slightest foundation from its inception to its termination. The charges that I have purchased the evidence with sums of money are equally false. When the time comes for me to explain how I fulfilled the solemn duty imposed upon me by this House of prosecuting these charges, I am willing to stand by the opinion of any gentleman whether I perpetrated any dishonourable transaction. (*Loud cheers.*)

Having said so much of the personal question, I ought to allude to the remarks of the hon. gentleman in respect to my having sent to the Governor General some of the documents on which these charges were based. I may mention that assailed as I was, and knowing that the Committee was to be of no service to me, and having made out a *prima facie* case, I felt it to be my duty to enclose the several documents to His Excellency, as well as to give them to the public in the papers. I accordingly addressed them to His Excellency with this note:—

Montreal 1st July, 1873

To His Excellency the Governor General:

My Lord,—I have the honour to enclose herewith copies of the Montreal *Herald*, weekly, of dates July 12th and July 21st, respectively, with a supplement to the Waterloo *Advertiser*, containing correspondence and affidavit of Sir Hugh Allan, letters of Mr. G.W. McMullen, the Hon. A.B. Foster, Senator, Hon. Sir Francis Hincks; and letters, drafts, and telegrams from Sir George-É. Cartier, Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, Hon. J.J. C. Abbott; and receipts of Hon. J.L. Beaudry, Hon. Henry Starnes, and others, formerly received from Sir Hugh Allan—all relating to the Pacific Railroad Enquiry. I venture to do so in consequence of statements, confidentially made by Ministerial journal, that Parliament is to be prorogued on the 13th of August, thus postponing the prosecution of the Pacific Railroad enquiry. I venture to believe that the perusal of these papers will convince your Lordship that the honour of the Crown and the highest interest of the country alike require that Parliament should meet on the day to which it stands adjourned, and that the investigation should be prosecuted without further

hindrance or delay. I have the honour to be, my lord, your obedient and humble servant,

(Signed)

L.S. Huntington.

His Excellency returned to me the document with a very polite note, marked “private”. I did not conceive that the crime of sending these reports to His Excellency was one that need have created any alarm.

To allude to the evidence, I would refer to one or two points to which the hon. gentleman made. I refer more particularly to the prorogation and the appointment of the Commission, and my refusal to come before it. As to the alleged agreements with reference to the prorogation, I never understood myself what the conversation was, I understood, that at the last moment the Premier had spoken of the prorogation, and the Opposition leader had persisted against it. Suppose that the evidence had been taken by the Committee, and instead of its being one of complete acquittal, as the hon. gentleman had alleged, it had clearly and conclusively established that the administration of the affairs of this country was in the hands of a set of men who sold a great public contract for the purpose of carrying the elections, that there sat behind them on the benches here, twenty-seven of the men whom Sir Hugh Allan controlled, and God knows how many others had been purchased. Suppose all this had been established, are we to understand that Parliament was to wait until its regular session, and that in the meantime these twenty-seven members might be receiving offices of trust and responsibility and the affairs of the country remain in the hands of the men who had thus been proved guilty, and that all this time Parliament could not be permitted to perform its duty of purging the nation of this scandal; but aside from any supposed understanding at that time, the circumstances had entirely changed since the adjournment, and they rendered a meeting of Parliament necessary.

The hon. gentleman pretends that I was afraid to come before the Commission because of the oath. When I made these charges I said I had no personal knowledge of them, and as the hon. gentleman really believes that I would be afraid to come forward to swear to what I knew, seeing that I had no personal knowledge about the matter, I only said that I was creditably informed and I have shown that I was creditably informed. Every man who had read the evidence knows that the accusations I preferred are true. (*Cheers.*)

When the Prime Minister attacked my personal honour, my social position, and my business occupation, when with a jeer that was almost inhuman, he pointed his finger across the House at that man who was only entitled to parliamentary credence. I sat here and bore it all. A little time later I heard the right hon. Minister stand up in his place and call his God to witness when he declared that there was not a tittle or shadow of foundation for even a suspicion of my charges. On the last occasion I had not Sir Hugh’s letters in my pocket. When I stood up in the House a week later, having obtained

these letters and attempted to read them, you sir, with that distinguished regard for the proprieties of the House, prevented me from doing so, and when the next day I was able to show you that I could read these papers without violating the rules of the House, the right hon. gentleman rose in his place and said I was a gentleman. (*Loud cheers and laughter.*) Before he said I was everything that was bad and that it was an infliction for him to live in the same city with me, but when he found I had the letters I was everything that was good, in fact my modesty prevents me from reciting all the compliments which the hon. gentleman was induced to pay me, when he saw me shaking Sir Hugh's letters at him. (*Cheers.*)

Let us refer to these letters. The member for Cumberland (Hon. Mr. Tupper) has said that there are some circumstances in them. How gingerly they treat Sir Hugh! What did they do when this great man came back, and when he found the testimony in the letters contradicted everything they had asserted, and proved everything I had claimed? They never thought of subjecting him to an examination in order to prove that his letters were false. How is it that the member for Vancouver (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks), whose prudence never deters him from replying to anybody and everybody, did not write a letter to the newspapers denouncing Sir Hugh, and proving that his letters were untrue? The member for Vancouver was silent, the member for Cumberland was silent. They should have denounced him when I made these charges, but when this great steamship owner, this man of millions, who subscribed so liberally at the elections to help the great party of Union and Progress, proved these charges by his own letters, they, cowards as they were, dared not contradict them, and they dare not contradict them tonight.

They knew what might happen when rogues fall out. Sir Hugh Allan is not a rogue. I am here prepared to testify to his great ability, and to the benefit which his magnificent success has been to this country, but when he returned to Canada, they did not assail him as having written letters that were false. There is evidence in the fact that they have stood like cowards under the infliction of these letters, which were the best evidence before the Commission according to the recognized principles of law. Hon. gentlemen will admit that it was a good legal principle that no accused man should be allowed to contradict by subsequent evidence written testimony which he has made before. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this because it is giving importance to this question, which he never dreamt of, and may compel him to give another speech of six hours instead of four, in order to show that nothing has been proved. Sir Hugh wrote these letters in the intimacy of business and while all the facts were fresh in his memory, to gentlemen on the other side of the lines, with whom he had been brought in contact by the innocent statesman and political know-nothing, the hon. member for Vancouver.

It is to be noted that these letters were written before Sir Hugh's memory become so remarkably defective as it was found to be, unfortunately, when he appeared before the Commission, and when he was compelled to acknowledge that he dare not give his evidence without first informing the Commission that he could not

trust his memory. There is another point which may apply to the hon. gentleman himself, and that is that a witness cannot make testimony in his favour. That is a principle of our law, and I think it is a correct one.

I now propose to read my charges, those charges which the hon. gentleman announced to the House that I had formally withdrawn. There is something refreshing in the spectacle of a leading member of the Ministry speaking upon a question of so much importance, standing up in his place in this House and declaring absolutely that I had formally withdrawn my charges. That would do in some places. It would do well enough in those Courts in Lower Canada known as Commissioners' Courts, where the advocates work for \$5 and the exclusive jurisdiction is \$25. (*Laughter.*) But I think it is very remarkable that on a great question of this nature a minister should make statements of this kind in the presence of two hundred members who know he does not mean a single word he says. (*Cheers.*)

I have not withdrawn my charges, Mr. Speaker, and I will read them for the benefit of the hon. gentleman. (*Cheers.*) I shall also read some evidence in order to show that the charges I made are now to become the facts. In this conviction, I stated these charges here in my place, not making any insinuations as the hon. gentleman does concerning Jay Cooke, insinuations which he dare not put to the test. (*Cheers.*) I stated then under a full sense of my responsibility, because I had then in my hands the evidence, evidence which I had not obtained from the Americans or from any of the parties referred to tonight, evidence which convinced me, in addition to what I knew before, that a monstrous political rascality had been perpetrated, and which impressed upon me the duty which lay before of taking upon myself the responsibility of making those charges. I knew that for some time, I would have to swim under water, and I could have then counted the names of the newspapers which would abuse me.

I will now read the first portion of my charge:—"That he, the said Lucius Seth Huntington, is credibly informed and believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence, that in anticipation of the legislation of last session as to the Pacific Railway, an agreement was made between Sir Hugh Allan, acting for himself and certain other Canadian promoters, and George W. McMullen acting for certain U.S. capitalists, whereby the latter agreed to furnish all the funds necessary for the construction of the contemplated railway, and to give the former a certain percentage of interest in consideration of their interest and position, the scheme agreed upon being ostensibly that of a Canadian Company, with Sir Hugh Allan at its head."

Now, sir, if the gentlemen will turn to page 210 of the evidence taken before the Commission, they will find the names of those Americans, and amongst them were the odious names of Messrs. Jay Cooke & Co., as well as others connected with the Northern Pacific Railway, who were introduced to Sir Hugh Allan by the hon. member for Vancouver.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS: That is not true.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON referred to the evidence on support of his assertion.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS: May I be allowed to explain. When certain gentlemen thought proper to come to the Government with a proposition for the construction of the Pacific Railway, and they stated that certain persons in the United States were prepared to build the road, the hon. gentleman has stated that I introduced those persons to Sir Hugh Allan. What I did was simply to give Sir Hugh Allan the list of names. (*Opposition cheers.*) Mr. McMullen brought to the Government all the persons who wanted to build the road.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: We will let it pass. At that time, of course, he knew nothing. I never saw such an innocent set of men. There was once a Society in the United States called the *Know Nothings*, and on one occasion when a certain person was being examined for initiation some one remarked that there was no need of examination in your case because you have got the natural proof. (*Laughter.*) The hon. gentlemen have not got the natural proof, but they see less and know less of what was transpiring around them than any other set of men I ever knew. Sometimes when I see them in this state I begin to regret that I had not an *entrée* to good society.

I will proceed to prove by the evidence the first part of the charge, that an agreement was made between Sir Hugh Allan and certain United States capitalists. The hon. gentleman then read the contract entered into between Sir Hugh Allan and his American associates, showing that they had agreed together to build the Pacific Railway, and that the Americans were to furnish all the money, the Canadians to have a percentage of the stock, and not to be obliged to pay anything. As the American connection began to leak out, Sir Hugh Allan intimated to his American friends that they would have to allow him to hold the stock for them, and then down to the 16th of September he writes to them for the return of money which he had spent in securing the contract.

I ask any hon. member in this House if he believes that Jay Cooke, of New York, was allowing Sir Hugh Allan to claim from him \$350,000 spent in the Canadian elections, if at this time he knew that he had been thrown overboard months before? Is it conceivable that the Government, if they had not had a guilty knowledge of the position of Sir Hugh Allan, and were not implicated in his transactions with the Americans—is it conceivable that they would have determined to sink or swim with him in such rascality? (*Cheers.*) It is easy for a man to declare that he will not turn his back upon his “pal”, and though our sympathies might be roused by appeals such as that we have heard tonight, and the duties of friendship, which the hon. gentleman has declared will induce him to stand by his friend in his peril, it is the duty of the Canadian people and the Canadian Parliament to deal, irrespective of these considerations, with the men charged with this great crime. The hon. gentleman might as well make an appeal for sympathy on this ground for any culprit who is brought up before the Courts. I wish to say this without offence; but, as I believe that this high crime has

been proved, I cannot use terms in describing my views that might perhaps not be offensive to gentlemen who are differently placed.

On page 205 of the evidence there is some interesting correspondence. Sir Hugh Allan, writing to General Cass, tells him how absurd he thinks is the cry about no foreign dictation, and he explains that Mr. McMullen has made a mistake in being desirous to secure the influence of inferior members of the Cabinet. As the hon. gentleman was among those who were not allowed to know what was going on, we may fairly believe that Sir Hugh Allan on the 1st of July regarded him as an inferior member of the Cabinet. (*Laughter.*) After reciting how he had managed so as to get on without these inferior members, he proceeds to say how he would secure the influence and support of Sir George-É. Cartier.

I want to call the hon. gentleman’s attention to this point. He passed an eulogy upon Sir George-É. Cartier. Sir George was the Solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway, and being a great friend of the Grand Trunk, was opposed to the Northern Colonization Railway. That being the case, I want to ask the hon. gentleman how he came to change his mind. It is quite clear that Sir George-É. Cartier’s conversion about railway matters had something to do with Sir Hugh Allan’s liberality. Suppose Sir George-É. Cartier had gone on with his opposition to the Northern Colonization Railway, does the hon. gentleman believe that Sir Hugh Allan would have supported this excellent Government which he loved so well? (*Laughter.*) I will sit down if the hon. gentleman wishes to explain. No reply? Ah! Sir, the thing will not hold water.

Sir George-É. Cartier was opposed to the scheme and Sir Hugh Allan was opposed to Sir George-É. Cartier on that account. We all know that while Sir George did love his country, he was extremely ambitious of power; and when in his decrepitude, when disease had crept over him, and he was about to be gathered to his fathers, he went down to Montreal, and his death was probably hastened by the disturbance and annoyance, which were recited by Sir Hugh Allan with so much gusto, as the means which he used to make him bow the knee to Baal. Although we know the cruelty and inhumanity of the proceedings, we must remember that there are men who look upon all things by price; and we must remember that when Sir George-É. Cartier went down to Montreal, on the day of his affliction and adversity, when the downfall of his Government was imminent, he was seized upon by those influences and by his vile conspiracy, and he was compelled to forego his convictions, and to yield to this enormous money influence, exerted, and we are told, not by his political supporter, who was anxious to subscribe for his benefit. (*Cheers.*) The hon. gentleman should have been an actor, but all who have heard him tonight must feel that the stage upon which he should play is not here, but where fiction takes the place of fact, and misrepresentation, if it is true to life, is considered true to reality.

There is another point which deserves attention. Sir Hugh, in one of his letters, refers to the influence he had exercised, and the members of Parliament he had secured. As a mere matter of curiosity, I should like to know who are the twenty-seven. (*Cheers*

and laughter.) We have in this House a Sir Hugh Allan brigade, consisting of 27 members. We have it upon Sir Hugh Allan's authority that they are sent here to vote for the Government, and if any of the twenty-seven desire to stand up, I will sit down. (*Loud laughter.*) How delighted that brigade must have been, and how their sore toes must have been relieved, when the hon. member for Cumberland in his eloquence wandered off to talk about the Nova Scotia elections—about the member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie), and when he struck that hon. member below the waist; and when, bye and bye, in a few words he preceded to assert that there was no evidence at all of corruption, how these 27 must have wilted. (*Laughter.*) Why, they were the exhibits themselves of their corruption! They were 27 of the 31 who voted down the investigation which I attempted to obtain here. (*Cheers.*) Will the hon. gentleman tell us how many steamships Sir Hugh Allan has, and is there one man to each steamship? Sir Hugh was asked at the Commission how many ships he had, but they had no need to ask him how many members of Parliament he had, because they had incontestable evidence that Sir Hugh had 27 here.

Those excellent men, the Commissioners—those impartial men whose duty it was to save the honour of the Government—were well aware of having a part to play in that celebrated cartoon, in which the right hon. the Prime Minister was represented as being on the bench, in the dock, and prosecuting the criminal. It was called “When shall we three meet again.” Oh! what a hang-dog look had that criminal in the dock. (*Laughter.*) How sage, wise, dispassionate, and blind, was the judge upon the bench; and what a flippant, spruce, determined, plucky, and resolute appearance had the fellow who, as Attorney General, was prosecuting the prisoner. (*Great laughter.*) This is scarcely a caricature, but is really a living representation of what actually took place. The Commissioners who were on the bench were the creation of the right hon. gentleman himself. I see there is an impression in high places that a more distinguished dignitary appointed them, but it is quite plain that the right hon. gentleman knew the calibre of this Commission before he jeopardized his position—before he allowed them to do what his own influence would not be sufficient to control. There are times when we must speak plainly. (*Hear, hear.*)

If they had not been men so ignorant of the law that they did not know that it is the first principle of the British Constitution that when an enquiry is commenced in Parliament, and Parliament is seized of it, no inferior tribunal has a right to question a member of that Parliament for words spoken on the floor of the House. (*Cheers.*) I have no doubt that these gentleman are as much amenable to the charge of having committed a breach of the privileges of this House as the right hon. gentleman who gave the order for their appointment.

Perceiving that there is no disposition on the part of these twenty-seven to rise, Mr. Speaker, (*great laughter*) I will proceed with another part of the subject. The hon. gentleman said that I had given a list of witnesses who were not able to prove anything, and that I was only fishing for evidence. Where was I fishing? (*Laughter and*

cheers.) Was it a very improper thing on me to fish from the hon. member for Vancouver in support of these charges? The hon. gentleman taunts me with having met witnesses on the street and telling them that I did not know what they were summoned for. I may say in reference to that that I met Judge Coursol on the street one day and he said to me: “I do not owe you any good turn for what you have done for me.” I said what have I done? He replied “Sending me to Ottawa.” I rejoined, you should be grateful to me that I do not go also to cross examine you. This is a portion of the conversation which Judge Coursol did not give in his evidence. Further, he said to me: “Well what are you going to prove by me.” Does any one suppose that I was going to disclose my case to him? I answer him in the same bantering tone: “Bah, I do not know, somebody must have suggested your name to me.” (*Derisive cheers from the Government benches.*) Ah, I see that strikes home. I will get at the twenty-seven yet. (*Great laughter and cheers.*)

Can the hon. gentleman tell me how it happened that the next morning after Judge Coursol's evidence was taken the Commissioners formulated the question if he knew why Hon. Mr. Huntington summoned him? (*Cheers.*) There is one right hon. gentleman opposite who could tell about that if he pleased. (*Cheers.*) Mr. Coursol told me on his return, and he was greatly pained at the fact, because it disclosed the disgraceful relations between the Commissioners and the Government; he told me, upon his honour, that he thought that somebody must have overheard the conversation, because he had never mentioned it to anybody here. If I were to examine Mr. Coursol there are some of my twenty-seven who would sit uneasily in their seats. (*Cheers.*)

My second charge was that the Government were aware of the negotiations between Sir Hugh Allan and his American associates. I never charged the Government with any direct negotiations with the Americans. On this point my charge has been grossly misrepresented by the hon. gentleman and by the newspapers under the contract of the Government. The charge was not that the Government carried on these negotiations, but that they were aware of the negotiations being carried on by Sir Hugh, while they were treating with Sir Hugh.

The hon. gentleman here adverted to the evidence in support of this portion of the charge, showing that the Government were not only aware of these negotiations from the fact that Sir Francis had suggested the American names to Sir Hugh, but also from the fact that the correspondence between Sir Hugh and the Americans was laid before the Premier before the contract was signed.

The third and fourth charges are of more importance, and are as follows:—“That subsequently an understanding was come to between the Government, Sir Hugh Allan and Mr. Abbott, one of the members of the Honourable House of Commons of Canada, that Sir Hugh Allan and his friends should advance a large sum of money for the purpose of aiding the elections of ministers and their supporters at the ensuing general elections, and that he and his friends should receive the contract for the construction of the railway. That accordingly Sir Hugh Allan did advance a large sum

of money for the purpose mentioned, and at the solicitation and under the pressing instance of Ministers.”

On page 145 Sir Hugh Allan had something to say on this point. I read from the published evidence which is as follows:—“Q—You stated that you were a very large subscriber of money for the support of the electors. That money was subscribed about what period; can you state the time? A.—On the 30th of July, I agreed to that amount of \$60,000 or \$75,000, I think, as stated in Sir George Cartier’s letter. He mentioned the amount he required on that date. I agreed to that, and subsequently within a day or two before I left for Newfoundland, he stated that he wanted a further sum, and I sent him over the letter to put down what he wanted, and he did put it down. I agreed to that also. That was the last I ever heard of the matter until I had gone to Newfoundland, and when I was in Newfoundland, I received two telegrams, I think from Mr. Abbott, on the subject of money. These telegrams I agreed to. He telegraphed to me also with regard to the receipt from Mr. Langevin, but I did not get the telegram, and did not know of it at the time. Q.—The letter of Sir George Cartier, of the 24th of August, of which a copy is published, is in these terms: —In the absence of Sir Hugh Allan, I shall be obliged by your supplying the central Committee with a further sum of \$20,000, upon the same conditions as the amount written by me at the foot of my letter to Sir Hugh Allan, on the 30th ultimo.

(Signed)

George-É. Cartier

P.S.—Please also send Sir John Macdonald \$10,000 more on the same terms.”

After adverting to other portions of Sir Hugh’s testimony on this point, he continued. We find from this evidence that Sir Hugh wanted the contract, and we find that Sir George-É. Cartier and the Premier wanted the money to carry on the elections. We find Sir Hugh got the contract and they got the money, and they want us to believe that it is only a leveller, or a madman, or a person like myself who has not the *entrée* to good society, who would think that the leaders of the great party of Union and Progress could be guilty of such things, or that there could be any connection in these transactions. Why, the discussion of the subject to this day is an insult to the intelligence of the country. (*Loud cheers.*) I have listened to the remarks of gentlemen whose ordinary intelligence I respect, upon this subject, with extreme pain, when I have been told by those who have read this evidence,—there are some such men, but thank God they are not numerous—that they saw nothing at all embarrassing to the Government. I have begun to believe that those were disciples of the know-nothing party who are rising up amongst us, and who will compel us to protect ourselves from partisan fidelity by some other means of governing the country, or we shall go on till we reach the very depths of corruption, but the public

opinion of this country, though fearfully dealt with, is not utterly corrupt, and if the hon. gentleman should be sustained by a majority of 50, his Government could not last.

There are men on both sides of the House devoted to principle. The people of Canada have a great future before them, and no Ministry who had gone to the indecent and criminal extent that the hon. gentleman had gone, could be sustained in this country either by one party or the other. (*Loud cheers.*) The model of a public man which the right hon. Premier affords, was not, he believed, the model which should be held up to the rising generation of this country. (*Cheers.*) The right hon. gentleman has never been a man of convictions; he has never been ready to cling for a moment to any principle when he saw that to do so would imperil his position. It had been as a dexterous catcher of the balls—now on this side, and now on that—that he has maintained himself in power, and by his success he has attached to himself men like the member for Cumberland, who declare they will stick to him till the death; but now the time comes when they have to choose between fidelity to party and fidelity to country.

There is a time when questions of this kind should be looked at gravely; when the elephant display made tonight by the hon. gentleman should give way for statesmanship and fair dealing with public questions. I am not prepared to deny when the hon. gentleman says that there may be wrongs on both sides of the House. I say that the possession of power under our constitutional system is a danger which can only be checked, and the system can only be worked, where there are two parties, the one acting as a check upon the other. If you continue a party in power, and allow it to use the patronage of the country to maintain itself, the Government will be almost certain to become impure.

If we could roll back the history of the Conservative party for the last ten years, it would be found to have been aided by contractors to an extent little dreamed of, but now we have to deal with a greater evil, and I know there are honest men on both sides of the House, who will rise above party, men who appreciate the peril in which the country stands, and who will not allow a crime more fearful than any ever committed under British institutions to be condoned because Ministers make eloquent appeals.

The hon. gentleman concluded a two hour speech by reading extracts from Macaulay’s account of the impeachment and disgrace of Leeds in the reign of William the Third. He sketched the parallel between the corruption in this case and the present case, and said the punishment and disgrace of Leeds was suggestive of the result of the present struggle. He resumed his seat amid loud cheers from the Opposition.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved the adjournment, and the House adjourned at 1.20 a.m.