

He contended that there was no further need of proof of a bargain than the letters and telegrams of Sir George-É. Cartier and Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. He had heard the Ministers of Customs and Finance state that they had no part in the monies which had been got from Sir Hugh Allan, but still they were willing to stand or fall by the whole Government. It was a noble thing to stand by a wronged and ruined compatriot, when that compatriot was proved to be wronged, but he saw no great chivalry in doing so at the present juncture, when such grave charges had been brought home to these colleagues. It had been charged against the Opposition that they would inaugurate an obstructive policy with regard to the Pacific Railway. He denied this entirely, and contended that they would certainly carry on that work as the state of the country and its financial condition would allow them.

If hon. gentlemen wanted to know the policy of Opposition, they ought to look to the measures they had advocated in the past. The country expected that this House at this time would give no uncertain sound upon this issue. He was sorry, for the honour and reputation of the country that such charges could have been brought home to the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. He was a believer in party Government himself, but he believed there were times in the history of every country when all parties should lay aside their differences, and work for the common good of the country. He believed, also, that this was one of these occasions. (*Hear, hear.*)

He hoped that the verdict of this House would be such as would convince the world that political morality had not altogether departed from this country, and that the people and the Parliament of Canada were determined to put down, at all hazards, a system of corruption which bade fair to make their very name a reproach. (*Cheers.*)

* * *

PRIVILEGE

Mr. Alderman Heney having been brought before the Bar of the House,

Mr. WRIGHT (Pontiac) stated he would defer his remarks for the present.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD stated that he had been very much surprised by the statement of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Cunningham). The statement had not been very clear, but since it was before the House, the House could see what the charge really was. It was quite impossible to do so until the statement was read. He therefore proposed that between now and seven-thirty p.m. the statement made by the hon. member for Marquette should be printed and placed in the hands of members. It was impossible to know what questions to put to the person at the Bar of the House without studying the statement.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE argued that the discussion on this matter should be postponed until nine p.m.

The SPEAKER gave orders that the Sergeant-at-Arms should be in attendance with Alderman Heney at that hour.

* * *

THE ADDRESS

Mr. WRIGHT (Pontiac) stated that he did not propose to go into the constitutional part of the question, since that had been discussed by abler men than him. He would not detain the House by reciting the oft-told tale of the prorogation, but he wished to approach the question in the spirit in which it was taken up by the people of the Province of Quebec.

He looked at the subject of the Pacific Railway to a certain extent in a sectional view. He felt there was nothing in which the County of Pontiac was more interested than the Pacific Railway. He said after the contract had been framed, in the interest of no particular section, but of the whole country, and when it was actually under contract it was with pain that he and his electors viewed the efforts of the Opposition to destroy it.

As a spectator in the gallery of the House when the Chief Engineer of the Pacific Railway brought in a report in favour of the eastern terminus of the Pacific Railway, and stated in that report that he had located the terminus of that road almost in the limits of the County of Pontiac, he had viewed the action of the Opposition with regret. When the hon. member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) rose from his seat and insisted that the valley of the Ottawa River was not the proper route for that road, but that the great Province of Ontario demanded that it should be built along the southern boundary of Lake Nipissing, he felt that that was the mercy his Province was to expect from members of the Opposition.

When the hon. member for Durham West (Hon. Mr. Wood), who had said he approached this question from no spirit of partisanship, stated that every measure which was brought down for the good of the country was brought down by the Opposition, he was somewhat surprised. His political teaching had not taught him that, but he believed that it was to the hon. gentlemen who now sat on the Treasury benches the country owed all that was good and prosperous in the country.

In the absence of the leader of the Quebec Party, who had been taken from them by death, and looking to the right hon. member for Kingston, he would not, in the hour of his (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald's) trial, desert him, nor would his electors wish him to desert that great statesman. It might be presumption in him long to detain the attention of the House. He would sit down with this explanation on his lips that he believed in the statesmanship of that hon. gentleman. He was loath to say that the gentlemen opposite had a fair line of conduct. When the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) rose in his place and made these grave charges against the honour of the Ministry, he for one was appalled. But what had been the course since? He would venture to say that the hon. member for Shefford and the Opposition had receded from the charges. (*Cheers.*)

Was it that money was spent at the election? Not at all. The gravamen of the charge was, that for gold—and that American gold—the Ministers of the country had sold the Pacific Railway charter. There was no man sufficiently dead to the interests of the country who would object to the employment of American capital in the ordinary enterprises of the country. He might say that large representatives of capital from the United States had come here and settled, and that they had contributed more to the interests of the Ottawa Valley than had been contributed by the fact of the seat of Government being settled here. But he would have objected to that, gold having come from the Northern Pacific Railway; and had the charge of the hon. member for Shefford been sustained, that hon. gentleman would have had no warmer supporter than himself.

He would say that he did not think it was good taste on the part of the Opposition to bring into the precincts of the House charges made by a man outside of the House. Let him get a seat in the House, but do not expose him to the opinion of the House without a seat therein. For the reasons he had given, he wished to proclaim to the House and the country, and to his constituents, to whom his word would go forth, that he had undying faith in the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government and his colleagues; and that he intended to support with all his might and main the amendment of the hon. member for Pictou.

Mr. MILLS said it seemed to him that there had been some misapprehension as to the issue created by the amendment to the amendment submitted to the House by the hon. member for Pictou (Hon. Mr. McDonald).

That hon. member had presented a motion of a most extraordinary character, a motion which, it seemed, to him had not been considered before the House, was asked to vote upon it.

When they looked at the amendment to the amendment to his hon. friend for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie), they found the hon. member for Pictou asked the House to declare that there existed throughout the country at elections a general system of corruption, a system of corruption not only upon the Ministerial side of that House, but also upon the Opposition side of the House. If a motion of that sort were supported by the House they would at once declare that they were unfit to transact business of any kind. If the representatives of the people in this House had been elected to their seats by a general system of corruption, it was important that the Crown should dissolve Parliament and that a new election should take place. He thought the logical sequence growing out of the amendment to the amendment, if it should prevail, would lead to the dissolution of the House of Commons. How could they transact the business of the country after they had declared themselves that they had obtained their positions by using improper means at the polls? He, for one, was not prepared to support a motion of that sort, as he would state with regard to his conduct in the matter, that he had not obtained his position as a representative of his constituency by illegal or improper means. (*Applause.*) And he must, therefore, oppose the amendment to the amendment. If hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House thought the motion was

one they could sustain, he would not question their conduct. He apprehended there were gentlemen on the other side of the House who had obtained their positions by the unbiased support of a majority of their constituencies. Those who had so obtained their present positions, whether they approved or disapproved of the conduct of the Administration, must oppose the amendment in question. They had been told by the Minister of Finance that the use of money in elections was not an improper proceeding and that money might be properly used for the purpose of taking voters to the polls, which was contrary to law. He also contended that the man who employed money would succeed, if the opposing candidate did not employ money.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said he referred to the law in New Brunswick, which did not touch that point.

Mr. MILLS continuing said that the hon. gentleman had assured them that such expenses, as he had referred to, were legitimate and that if the money was spent in that manner they had no right to find fault. In alluding to the differences which existed amongst the hon. gentleman, he said hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House argued that there was nothing wrong in obtaining money from a gentleman who was a contractor for the Government, so long as the Pacific charter itself was not sold. They said, you do not show that the money was given for the charter. If that were admitted, then they would say it was properly enough obtained, and there was nothing wrong in taking the money and expending it in the way it was spent. He (Mr. Mills) maintained that it was improper to take the money, although there might have been no bargain, as they were not at liberty to deal, under the circumstances with him as with other parties.

He was prepared to support the motion of want of confidence, if nothing had been proved in regard to the Pacific Railway charter, because he entirely disapproved of the policy they had pursued. The Administration should always have a policy by which they were prepared to stand or fall. The House was aware that this had not been the case. In England the Administration put forward a policy for which they sought the approval of their party. The existing Government was practically a personal Government. With regard to the Pacific scandal, he said not once had sufficient evidence been disclosed under the illegal Commission to justify them in condemning the Administration but the conduct of the Administration, during the time these charges were first made was such as would justify the House in censuring them for the course they had pursued.

What had been the last act in reference to the matter? The despatch of His Excellency had been improperly and irregularly laid upon the table. In Great Britain it was improper to quote the opinion of the Crown in any matter before Parliament. The despatches of His Excellency were placed upon the table of that House for the purpose of influencing members in reference to the question now under consideration. (*Cries of order from the Ministerial benches.*) He thought there could not be two opinions as to the reason for laying these despatches before the House.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was incorrect for the hon. gentleman to state that the representative of the sovereign send down certain despatches for the purpose of influencing the House.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the hon. gentleman was entitled to deal with these despatches as they had been laid upon the table, and with the advice of the hon. gentleman opposite, under which the despatches were brought before the House.

The SPEAKER: No doubt the hon. member might criticise the subject of the despatches. The point was that the despatches were sent down with a view of influencing the House. That, he thought, was not a line of argument which should be pursued.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he understood the contention of the hon. gentleman was that the advice tendered, upon which the despatches were brought down, was advice which should not have been given.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was glad his hon. friend had reduced it to this one point—that the advice on which the despatches were brought down ought not to have been given. The despatches were sent down by the representative of the Sovereign in order to place the subject in a correct position. The Government offered no advice upon the subject.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said the statement of the hon. gentleman was irregular in the last degree. It was not possible that these despatches could be sent down without the responsibility of the Ministers of the day. (*Hear, hear.*) They had the right to express any opinion or to make any motion or proposition that that advice ought not to have been tendered, that His Excellency was ill-advised and misled in sending them down, and that that ill advice and misleading was for the purpose of swaying this debate under cover of His Excellency's name. (*Cheers.*)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he could only say he was quite willing to submit to censure for having allowed, if the word allowed was a correct word, these despatches to be laid before the House. He thought that the Sovereign in this country was not only a word, but was an identity, that he had certain power, and that if he supposed it necessary for the due understanding of his position that certain papers should be sent down, then they should be sent down, as they were sent down. He would like to know if gentlemen opposite impugned the position that the Governor General had a right, as representative of the Sovereign, to send down to this House, for its consideration, such documents as he pleased or as he thought expedient. If that doctrine was not adopted, what would be the case? The connection between England and Her Colonies, which was supposed to be a real vital connection, was a mere sham. The Governor General as representative of the Sovereign had a right to communicate to this House what information he pleases.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON: On the advice of his Ministers? My position is that the Crown cannot communicate with this House

except upon the advice and responsibility of the Ministers. (*Hear, hear.*)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said they differed *in toto*. The position he took, and the position taken by the hon. gentleman, were as diverse as the poles were asunder. The hon. gentleman said that the Governor General cannot make any communication except what his advisers in this country shall advise him to make; now, if that be so, where is the connection with the mother country? (*Laughter.*) If it be true that whatever His Excellency does is under the advice of his Dominion advisers, how can it be said in any way that he represents Her Majesty?

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON said he hoped the leader of the Government would not keep that extraordinary position. He contended that these despatches could not be brought down, except on the advice of His Excellency's Ministers, and when they were brought down they had a right to discuss them. Why were they here? If the Governor General, as an Imperial officer, defended his own position to his Imperial master, they had nothing to do with that. His defence could be laid before the Imperial Government, and when it came back here, we might judge it.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: He would refer to an authority which could not be disputed. They laid down the doctrine in this way. The irregular use of the Queen's name to influence the decision of the House is unconstitutional in principle and inconsistent with the independence of Parliament. Where the Crown has a distinct interest in the measure, there is an authorized mode of communicating Her Majesty's recommendations, but Her Majesty cannot be supposed to have a private opinion apart from that of her responsible advisers, and any attempt to use her name in a debate to influence the judgment of Parliament would be immediately checked or censured.

In a remonstrance of the Lords and Commons to Charles 1st, 16th December, 1641, it was declared that it is their ancient and undoubted right and privilege that Your Majesty ought not to take notice of any matter in agitation or debate in either of the Houses of Parliament, but by their information or agreement and that Your Majesty ought not to propound any condition, provision or limitation to any Bill or Act in debate or preparation in either House of Parliament, or to manifest or declare your consent or dissent, approbation or dislike of the same before it be presented to your Majesty in due course of Parliament.

On the 17th of December, 1783, the Commons resolved that it is now necessary to declare that to report any opinion, or pretended opinion, of His Majesty, upon any bill or other proceeding depending in either House of Parliament, with a view to influence the votes of members, is a high crime and misdemeanour derogatory to the honour of the Crown, a breach of the fundamental privileges of Parliament, and subversive of the constitution of this country. He said he deprecated the introduction of these despatches during the debate, because they already heard two members declare that they were influenced by the opinions expressed in these despatches.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said he desired to point out that the hon. gentleman opposite had raised a phase of the case which was not open on the present occasion. He had made the suggestion that in his character as an Imperial officer, His Excellency might have certain independent rights of communication with this Parliament. He (Hon. Mr. Blake) did not so believe, but admitting it for the sake of argument, it was not pretended by anyone the despatches sent down here were despatches from the Imperial Government, or were in any shape, way, or sense, communications from Her Majesty or from Her Majesty's advisers in England.

They were despatches sent by His Excellency to the Colonial Secretary. They were an expression of His Excellency's opinions and his recitals of certain facts, and, therefore, in order to sustain his argument, and make it applicable to the present case, the hon. gentleman would be obliged to establish that the opinion of His Excellency and the statement of facts by him, communicated or not communicated to the Imperial authorities, was a fit subject of communication to this House without the advice of the responsible Minister. In order to preserve that immunity from observation the Constitution as applicable to the head of the Executive, it was absolutely necessary that we should denounce that doctrine. It was absolutely necessary that if this Parliament be wronged by such communication, we should have Ministers who are responsible to us for the wrong. (*Loud cheers.*)

We should repudiate that idea. He was sure His Excellency knew his position too well for one instant to do anything which might bring him in conflict with the people over whom he rules, but a wrong had been done, and it was his Ministers who did it. Then we can condemn, or approve, as our judgment shall command, while the head of the Executive remains in that severe altitude, which he had above Parliamentary condemnation or approval. (*Cheers.*)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said this was a question of vital importance for the connection between England and Canada. He repudiated the doctrine announced by the member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) and he said it was the first gun fired for the disseverance of the Colonies from England. (*Derisive cheers.*) We could not buy any assumption of our own power, by an exaggeration of our power, by taking a position that we cannot sustain, prevail against this fact, that we were a Colony, a dependency of England. If this House would keep that straight before them; if in their discussion they would remember that we were a dependency of England, and, being a dependency, we must submit to the control and the restraint and the restriction of being a dependency, then there would be no difficulty. If we had got too large for that condition, if it be true that we were repining against these restraints, if we desired to give up the position of colonists, then we would take the ground of the hon. member for Bruce South, but if it be a fact, and it was a fact, that he gloried in and that a majority of this House gloried in, that we were still a dependency, still a subordinate authority, that we were still bound to submit to Imperial control, if that be true, then the doctrine he laid down was true. The hon. gentleman cannot be a subordinate and independent at the same time. He could not be the captain and the mate at once.

We exist by statutory authority, we have yet no common rights. So long as we were colonies, we must submit to the condition of things consequent upon that subordination. Are we not a colony? Do we not submit to Imperial authorities and ought we not to do so?

When Her Majesty sent her representative here with a special Commission, he had certain powers and certain duties and certain responsibilities, and among these duties and these responsibilities are the responsibilities which must weigh upon him primarily, namely, to perform his duty to his sovereign, who gave him his commission. Well, what was the commission? It was to govern this country according to its limited Constitution—to the statutory Constitution which we have got; and if he sees that by any act, or by any movement, or any authority, constituted or not constituted in this country, this commission of his was in any way controverted, it was his bounden duty to take the position consequent upon obedience to the authority he may have received from his Royal Mistress.

Certain gentlemen might say that they ought to have tendered advice, but he said that from his reading of the Constitution he believed the Governor General of this country had the right to send down in his principal capacity any communication that he might choose to make to this House, even if it be against the advice of his Ministers. (*Oh! Oh!*) He could quite understand that the Governor of a Province, having got direct instructions to convey certain things to the Legislature, would do so, against the advice of his Ministers. (*Oh! Oh!*) He could quite understand that the Governor of a Province having got direct instructions to convey certain things to the Legislature, would do so, against the advice of his advisers, and if he did not do so, then what mode had the Empire of communicating with the colonies—in what way could Her Majesty communicate with a colony, if it so happened that the Ministry for the time being did not choose to make that communication.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON: He can dismiss them and find Ministers who will take the responsibility.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was glad he had brought the hon. gentleman to that position, that the Governor General might dismiss his Ministry, though they had a majority in Parliament, and because they would not do so and so, as the Governor wished. Was that the proposition of the hon. gentleman?

Hon. Mr. HOLTON: My proposition is that the Governor General in this country occupies the position of the Sovereign in England, so far as our Parliamentary system is concerned. The King can do no wrong, why? Because the King can perform no act; the Governor General, with reference to our affairs, can perform no act without the advice of responsible Ministers. That is my proposition.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman was altogether wrong, and he did not defend the proposition he announced a minute ago. That was a slavish principle, that the Governor General could send for a Ministry having control of Parliament and say "If you do not do so and so, you may go." What

he (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) said was this, we could not have dependence and complete sovereignty.

He would give the hon. gentleman an instance of how wrongly his doctrine would work. The hon. gentleman might remember the time when the Empire ran riot on the question of free trade. There were certain principles laid down in favour of free trade, which were considered to be vital, and which the Imperial Government were anxious should prevail in the Colonies. Suppose Her Majesty's Government had instructed the Governor General of Canada to send down to this House a despatch stating that free trade must be carried unconditionally. Suppose that the members on both sides of the House did not agree to that dispatch: if the doctrine of the hon. gentleman was carried out, the Governor General must either resign his office or the Government must resign.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE: Is that this case?

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was not so much concerned in asking whether it was this case, as he was concerned in asserting a general principle.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE: Which does not apply.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: If we lay down a general principle, it will be very easy afterwards to settle this case. With reference to these despatches, the Governor General had a right to send them down if he thought proper. No Government could resist if the Governor General, as an Imperial officer, desired to send these papers down. More than this, he would tell the hon. gentleman that no matter who the Governor General might be, no matter what the despatch might be, no matter whether it would be the ruin of the Government or not, whenever the Governor General, as representative of the Sovereign, asked him, as a member or the Government, to send that information down to Parliament, he was not the man to refuse. He could not understand how any communication from the Sovereign, or representative of the Sovereign, that could in any way be of any use to this House, could be rejected. If it be so rejected, it was because there was a desire to refuse information rather than received it. (*Feeble cheers from a few members on the Government side.*)

Mr. MILLS resumed his argument. He discussed the events that transpired after the rejection of Mr. Huntington's motion, and in reference to the plea that the Committee should not proceed in the absence of Sir Hugh Allan, in order that he might be present to cross-examine witnesses, he observed that when the Commission met, Sir Hugh Allan was not allowed to cross-examine witnesses, though he applied through his counsel for leave to do so. He also discussed the constitutionality of the Oaths Bill, and argued that it could not be decided by the English law officers but upon a case submitted to the Judicial Committee, and argued on both sides. For his part, he maintained that it was *ultra vires*.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS

Mr. MILLS resumed the debate. He said that so far as the construction of the law was concerned the judgment of a Court was not considered authoritative, and cited precedents from the English Courts in support of his statement. If so much care was taken in an ordinary Court, how much more important was it that care should be taken in a question of constitutional law. He contended that it was a most unfortunate thing that the questions of constitutional law should be decided by the law officers of the Crown in England on the *ex parte* statements of the Ministers. Such decisions could not be considered authoritative and did not in other Colonies settle such questions.

They should be submitted to the Privy Council and be argued there and an authoritative judgment given by this court of competent jurisdiction. Several questions had arisen in this country which had given a good deal of dissatisfaction. Not only the disallowance of the Oaths Bill and the prorogation.

At this juncture Mr. Dodge entered the House and took his seat, being welcomed by cheers from the Ministerial Benches.

Mr. MILLS continued. He knew that the statement was made by the Hon. Minister of Justice that the House would meet *pro forma* and prorogue on the 13th August, but he contended that this could only have been meant if the report of the Committee had entirely exculpated the Ministers.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I would ask the hon. member if when the House consented to that arrangement he considered that the statements of the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) would be disproved.

Mr. MILLS: Most certainly. After the statement of the hon. Minister of Justice that there was no shadow or tittle of evidence to sustain the charges of the hon. member for Shefford, could the Ministers have continued to hold office if the report of the Committee had been incriminatory? He contended that the Ministers, when the Committee adjourned, should have put a notice in the *Gazette*, calling the House for business on the 13th of August. He contended that there was no power in the Act to issue the Commission. The best proof that the Commission was not according to the law was the fact that the hon. member for Shefford, who had been summoned as a witness, had not been arrested for refusing to attend. The Commission had been issued on account of the statements made in the House by the hon. member for Shefford. Now a member for the House could not be called to account for statements made in the House.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: Supposing the hon. member for Shefford got up in the House and accused me of committing a larceny, and supposing I were indicted before a Court of Oyer and Terminer, would the hon. gentleman have a right to give his evidence to the Court in order to convict me of the larceny, on the ground that he was a member of the House? (*Hear, hear.*)

Mr. MILLS: By the Bill of Rights it was expressly provided that a member could be questioned or be brought to task for no word uttered in Parliament, except by the High Court of Parliament itself, and the issue of the Commission to do so was unconstitutional and without precedent.

With regard to the express wording of the amendment of the hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie), the number of acts separate and distinct in themselves which constituted the policy of the Administration for the past few years, pointed to the conclusion that they were guilty of taking money for the purpose of carrying the elections. From the time this Commission began its enquiry up to the day Mr. Campbell was examined, the witnesses called all knew nothing, and the whole enquiry appeared from the beginning to be prosecuted with the intention of proving by implication that all the charges were untrue.

The tone of the Ministerial journals from the first was in the same direction, from the day that Mr. McMullen's letters were published; but the day that Mr. Campbell appeared before the Commission the tactics were changed, and he could think of no other reason for this than that the Government had, by this time, come to the conclusion that unless some face were put upon it, they would undoubtedly have to submit to a Parliamentary enquiry, and they, therefore, had better admit a certain portion of the charges, as much as they thought it would be safe for them to do—more, as it would appear, that they were quite safe in doing.

But there were other things in this report which it was well that the attention of the House should be called to. There were discrepancies between the reports appearing in the newspapers and the report contained in the blue book of the evidence adduced before the Commission. The questions were not the same as those appearing in the newspapers. Important statements which appeared in the public journals were omitted, and the answers to many of the questions were considerably changed. Sometimes the formation of both questions and answers were so much changed as to give an entirely different meaning to the evidence. Why was this so? He did not know. It might be said that the newspaper reports were not correct, but, as a rule, when two independent authorities accorded in a matter of this kind, as was the case with two leading journals on this point, it was pretty good proof of their correctness.

He referred to the evidence of Sheriff Leblanc, of Montreal, in proof of the assertion that Sir George-É. Cartier knew when he was dealing with Sir Hugh Allan that he was dealing with the American Company. Then they had the sworn testimony of Sir Hugh that he obtained the charter for a certain monetary consideration, and the compact, so far as Sir George was concerned, was not withdrawn. Apart from there being any contract, it was a highly improper proceeding for the Government to accept money from Sir Hugh. He considered that there was evidence of a bargain. How came it that when they were discussing the question of the charter that \$25,000 were promised to aid in the elections?

He considered there was sufficient evidence of an improper understanding having existed between the Government and Sir

Hugh, and he had not confidence in the policy the Government had pursued, and for these reasons he would support the amendment of his hon. friend the member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie). The manner in which the matter had been conducted also led him to the conclusion that it would be improper for him to support the First Minister of the Crown. (*Cheers.*)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD [then rose and was received with deafening cheers, which lasted for some minutes]: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to address you on the two motions now before the House, and the reason why I did not so intend is that I had already given my testimony on oath, and in that testimony I had endeavoured, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, to state the whole case as far as I knew it, according to the best of my conscience, concealing nothing and revealing everything. Therefore, I did not think it well, according to the ordinary rule, that I should attempt in any way to supplement my statement on oath by my statements not on oath. (*Cheers.*)

However I have been taunted, not in the House certainly, but I have heard it elsewhere and have seen it in the papers that I have been withholding my statements; that I have been keeping back, and that I dare not meet the House and the country.

Sir, I dare meet this House and the country. (*Cheers.*) I know too well what the House and the country will do, and what the feeling of the country will be, when they know all the facts. They know many of them now, and those they do not know I shall endeavour presently to enter upon.

But now I enter upon the subject which is most interesting to this House—the question whether the Government or any members of the Government were in any way implicated in the giving or granting of a charter, or of a privilege of any kind to men for corrupt motives. I shall allude to one or two subjects which a short time ago assumed prominence in the opinion of the country, but which in the course of the present debate have almost sunk into insignificance.

A short time ago, from the 13th August till now, we heard nothing else but the unconstitutionality of the prorogation; nothing else but that a great wrong had been committed on the privileges of the House. Although I was here for only a few minutes before the House was prorogued, if I remember aright, this Chamber rung with charges that the privileges of the House had been invaded. I not only heard the voice of the hon. member for Châteauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton), but I saw his hand brought down, with the ponderous strength of the hon. gentleman, on his desk, when he called "Privilege!" and all because the representative of the Sovereign had exercised a prerogative conferred upon him by law. The hon. gentleman was committing an anachronism.

There were days when the prerogative of the Crown and the privileges of the people were in opposition. There were days—but they were days long gone by, and there was no necessity for any attempt to revive them now—days when the prerogative of the

Crown was brought in opposition to the will of the people and the representatives of the people, and then, as was proper, the will of the people was paramount, and when the Crown opposed it, by prerogative or by excess of prerogative, the head of the Sovereign rolled on the scaffold. But, Mr. Speaker, those days do not exist now, and I am happy to say that at this moment in this age, the prerogative of the Crown is a portion of the liberties of the people. (*Cheers.*)

Centuries ago, as I have said, the time was when the Sovereign could come down with his strong hands and could seize, or attempt at all events to seize, a member of Parliament for performing his duty in his place. The day was once when the Sovereign could come down and could banish and send to the tower, and even as has been known, could send to the block, members of Parliament for defending the privileges of the people.

But when the Sovereign is no longer a despot, when the Sovereign is a constitutional monarch, when the Sovereign takes his advice from the people, when the Sovereign in his act of prerogative takes his advice from a committee selected from the representatives of the people and from the other Chamber, which other Chamber has its power resting upon the basis of the will of the country and the will of the people, then I say there is no danger of the prerogative being used unconstitutionally; but the great danger of the country here, as in England, is that the prerogative may not be strong enough to resist the advancing wave of democracy. (*Cheers.*)

And, Sir, when in the undoubted exercise of the prerogative of the Crown the representative of the Sovereign came not to this Chamber but to the proper Chamber, and announced his will, as the representative of the Sovereign, that Parliament be prorogued, he committed no breach of the privileges of this House or the other House of Parliament, and made no infringement on the liberties of the people. (*Cheers.*) It was charged that a great breach of the Constitution had taken place.

True it is that we heard in a sort of minor key from the *Globe*, which had some character to lose, that although it was very inexpedient, it was no breach of the Constitution. But every other paper, I believe, every organ of hon. gentlemen opposite except the *Globe*, stated that there had been a great breach of the Constitution and of the privileges of the people on the floor of Parliament, and they were countenanced by the voice and clamour of hon. gentlemen opposite. (*Cheers.*) We might pardon them, perhaps, because we have seen cases of a similar kind in England, and therefore I can quite understand it, and I do not much blame them, as showing the momentary feeling of disappointment at the exercise of the Royal prerogative, preventing the extension of the excitement into debates in a subsequent session.

In 1820, at the time of Queen Caroline's trial, when the bill was pending, when it was resolved to withdraw the bill, and when the motion for the six months' disposal of that measure was carried, there was an outburst when the knock of the Usher of the Black

Rod was made at the door—an outburst of indignation on the part of the Queen's friends because they had no opportunity of expressing their feelings against the course which had been taken. Parliament, however, was prorogued, notwithstanding the storm of indignation that arose at the time.

On a still later occasion, at the time of the Reform bill, in 1831, we can remember how the House was almost in mutiny, and how that staid gentleman, the Duke of Richmond, almost declared himself in rebellion against his Sovereign. Sir Robert Peel at the very moment the Usher of the Black Rod knocked at the door was making a most indignant protest against prorogation for the purpose of dissolution. Therefore when such staid men and men of such high position could take that course, we can perhaps pardon hon. gentlemen opposite for having betrayed an unseemly warmth on the 13th of August because the prerogative of the Crown was exercised as the Crown had the right to exercise it.

God forbid that the day should ever come in England or in Canada when the House of Commons should be so strong as to prevent the exercise of that prerogative; when the House of Commons, the people's representatives, should usurp the power of the Crown and sit *en permanence* and declare that they would decline to be prorogued, then the liberty of the people of England and Canada as sanctioned and secured by the British Constitution will be gone. Perhaps we might get other liberties from other constitutions, but the British Constitution is gone forever whenever the day shall come that the Sovereign cannot send a message saying the representatives of the people, the Upper Chamber, are prorogued at the will of the Sovereign.

Therefore, it occurs to every hon. gentleman who has considered the subject well, that the question of constitutionality cannot exist for a moment and that a question of privilege set up against prerogative is altogether a false cry, an untenable cry, a cry unconstitutional and unwarranted by law. (*Cheers.*) The prerogative at present is valuable only as one of the liberties of the people, and it is one of the liberties of the people because it is guided, as I said before, by the advice of Ministers responsible to the two Houses of Parliament, not alone to this Chamber. The prerogative is not dangerous. There is no hazard that any one of our liberties, personal or political, will be endangered, so long as the prerogative is administered on the advice of a Minister having the support and requiring support from the two Chambers of Parliament. (*Cheers.*)

The question then comes whether the present Ministers of his Excellency the Governor General were justified in recommending the prorogation on the 13th day of August. Sir, if they had not given that advice they would have the Sovereign to break his word; they would have advised the Sovereign to commit a breach of faith against every absent member of Parliament. I can say in the presence of this House, in the presence of the country, and in the presence of the world, if the world were listening to our rather unimportant affairs, that if ever a pledge, if ever a bargain, if ever an agreement or arrangement was made, it was that the House should be prorogued on the 13th day of August.

Some of the gentlemen who have spoken, I won't tax my memory as to which of them, have made the constitutional objection that the House never agreed to the prorogation on the 13th of August. Sir, the House had nothing to do with it. It is not a matter of agreement between the Sovereign and the people; it is a matter of prerogative. Did any educated man, any man who knows what the Constitution in Canada or what the Constitution in England is, believe that I, the First Minister of the Crown, could get up in my place and tell this House that on the 13th August it would be prorogued, and that on that day there was no real necessity for members being present, because it was to be merely a formal meeting? That I, a Minister of nearly twenty years standing—*(hear)*—who ought to know by practice, and do know by study, somewhat of the British Constitution, should make that announcement unless I had got the authority of my master; had got the sanction of the Crown?

As a matter of course, as his Excellency has stated in the answer he made to the gentlemen who waited upon him, I submitted the proposition to his Excellency and took his pleasure upon it, just as the First Minister in England would take the pleasure of her Majesty as to the day on which prorogation was to take place. I got the sanction of his Excellency the Governor General to make that statement, and if I had not got that sanction I do not believe the House would have agreed to the long adjournment. *(Hear, hear.)* Why, there was a protest made by my hon. friend from Cariboo (Mr. Thompson) on that point, and there was a general feeling in the House. There was an obvious and universal feeling, and there was no objection made to it, that it was quite absurd to suppose that we would return in midsummer, after a winter session from all parts of the country for the purpose of receiving the report of this Committee. *(Hear, hear.)*

I made that statement to this House and every hon. member, the hon. gentleman at all events on the front benches, the hon. gentlemen who hope, and perhaps will succeed in their hope, to take positions where they will be responsible for carrying on the Government under constitutional principles, could not have supposed that I would venture, as the first Minister here, to make a statement to Parliament that it would be prorogued on a particular day, unless I had the sanction of the Crown for making such statement. *(Cheers.)* That sanction I sought and that sanction I obtained.

We will look back for a moment to see whether I was right, whether the Government was right—in speaking of myself I speak of myself and my colleagues—whether we ought to receive the sanction of the House in giving that advice. Let us look back to the circumstances of the case. I invite the careful attention of the House, and especially the attention of those hon. members who were not members of the Parliament of Canada at that time, to the circumstances of the case.

In February, I think it was, there was a Royal Charter given for the purpose of building a Pacific Railway, to the Pacific Railway Company. They went home,—their President Sir Hugh Allan and certain other members of the Board—for the purpose of attempting

to carry out this charter which had been given to them. The charter had been given to them according to the vote of the Parliament of Canada, and every clause of it was in accordance with the provisions of the law passed by the Parliament of Canada. *(Cheers.)* These gentlemen had gone home to England to lay a great scheme, so great a scheme, Mr. Speaker, that some of the hon. gentlemen opposite said that it was going to over tax our resources and destroy our credit, and that they could not succeed at all with so small a population in such a young country. They had gone home to England to lay the project before the English world and European capitalists. They were going there to operate, and it depended much on the support they received from this country, from the Parliament and press of Canada, whether they could succeed or not. They had gone home in February.

Parliament met early in March, I think. The hon. member for Shefford rose in his place and made his charge against the Government on the 2nd of April. The hon. gentleman may have been, I do not say he was not, actuated by principles of fine patriotism in making that charge; but whether he was so actuated or not, whether his motives were parliamentary or unparliamentary, patriotic or unpatriotic, one thing is certain, that the direct aim, the direct object, the point at which that motion and that statement were directed, was to kill the charter in England. *(Cheers.)* The weapon was aimed with that object, not so much with the desire of destroying the Administration, not so much with the purpose of casting a reflection upon the Ministry, as with the view of destroying that first on the expectation that the Ministry would fall afterwards. That was the aim; there was no doubt about it, and when the hon. gentleman's motion was defeated, and when I took up the resolution the aim was well intended—the desire of killing was well intended—but it failed in the execution. *(Hear, hear.)*

When I took it up I considered the whole position of events. Sir Hugh Allan and those connected with him went to England in March. Parliament was sitting at the time the hon. gentleman made his motion. I could not know how long Parliament would last, and the chances were that they would return some time before the end of the session. If they did not return then, of course I considered that there could be no examination until they did, but I thought they might return. I declare that I never for a moment supposed that the hon. member when he made his statement, could be guilty of such great, such palpable, such obvious injustice, as to press his Committee in the absence of Sir Hugh Allan, Mr. Abbott and Sir George-É. Cartier, when they had no opportunity of defending either themselves or the charter which they had obtained.

The House must remember also that the motion made by the hon. gentleman went much further than my motion. The motion of the hon. member, which he moved on the 2nd of April, was not only to inquire into the facts that he mentioned, the statements upon which he based his motion, but to go into the whole of the subject connected with the charter and the granting of the charter to the Pacific Railway Company. The aim of his motion was to destroy that charter.

I will read the motion of the hon. member. After detailing the facts, he moved “that a Committee of seven members be appointed to inquire into all the circumstances connected with the negotiations for the construction of the Pacific Railway, with the legislation of last session on the subject, and with the granting of the charter to Sir Hugh Allan and others.” So that the aim of the hon. gentleman in making that motion was not simply to attack the Government, not simply that from improper motives or inducements of any kind they had given the charter, but was for the purpose of destroying that charter and of attacking all the legislation of the previous session on which the charter was based.

I never for one moment supposed that any hon. member would be guilty of the gross injustice of attempting to attack the whole of the legislation of the previous session and the charter solemnly granted under an Act of Parliament, and of attempting to affect vested interests on which a million of money had been staked, in the absence of the persons primarily interested. That motion was made, and was intended to be a vote of want of confidence. Was that so? Or was it not so? Will the hon. gentleman say it was not so?

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: The motion when made was intended to express precisely what it did express. (*Laughter.*)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is said, Sir, that if there had been one honest man in the cities of Sodom or Gomorrah they might have been saved; and so the Opposition may be saved in the same way, for they have one honest man in their ranks—the member for Wentworth South (Mr. Rymal)—who stated that that motion was intended to be a vote of want of confidence. Everybody knew that that was its design (*Hear, hear*), and yet at this day, at this late hour, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Huntington) had not the manliness to get up and say so. (*Cheers.*) He dare not say it was not a motion of want of confidence. It was meant in that way, and I can prove that it was by my hon. friend the member for Wentworth South. I call him the hon. gentleman and I believe him. He said it was so. Will the hon. gentleman not believe him? Although differing from him in politics, I know he would not say what was not true. If I remember rightly, the hon. member for Shefford said he would make the motion when we went into Committee of Supply. He gave the necessary notice that is always given in such cases, and I certainly supposed that he intended to make a general motion on our policy connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said he was going to make a motion on that subject, and it was by mere accident that when my friend, the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Tilley), rose to make his Budget speech, with you in the chair, instead of a Committee of Supply, the hon. member said he would take another opportunity of making the statement in connection with the Pacific Railway. Had we gone into Committee of Supply, the hon. gentleman would have made, in the ordinary Parliamentary way, his motion of want of confidence. But, besides, if this House wants any other witness than our own common sense, which goes for something, in the next place there is evidence of the hon. member for Wentworth South, which goes for something. (*Cheers.*)

I would quote an authority which hon. gentlemen opposite don't pretend to despise, that is the authority of the *Globe*. (*Renewed cheers.*) We have also the authority of *The Mail*. *The Mail* publishes articles which we sometimes approve of, and sometimes don't approve of, but no article in all my experience that has ever appeared in the *Globe*, and no proposition made therein has been denounced. They have all been accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, what did the *Globe* correspondent of the 1st of August say? He said “Mr. Huntington's motion, of which he gave notice today, we suppose will refer to some transactions brought to light by the Americans who have been concerned in these Pacific Railway transactions from an early date. Tomorrow is looked forward to as a grand field day in the Commons. Hon. Mr. Huntington's motion is, of course, equivalent to an expression of want of confidence, and until it is disposed of no other business can be transacted.” Was this motion a motion of want of confidence or not? The hon. gentleman intended it as a motion of want of confidence and there is no reason why it should not be so. The hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) founded on the same state of things his want of confidence motion.

But he should have given notice of his attack, for a more unmanly attack is unknown. What notice had been given that he was going to make that motion? True, the Government of the day are unworthy of their position unless they are ready to meet any charges brought against them. But had we the most remote information respecting that personal matter? And even when on the second day he announced that he was going to postpone to a future occasion further action he did not venture to give the slightest intimation to the men he was going to attack, the men whose characters he was going to attack of what he was going to say; but he took us by surprise and sought by bringing in documents carefully prepared to get a Committee on these statement for the purpose. Certainly it would have been so if the Committee had been granted as he proposed,—of killing, as it was designed to kill, as it was bound to kill, the efforts of the Canadian people to get a body of English capitalists, to build the Pacific Railway. (*Loud cheering.*)

He could not possibly have supposed that he would have got the inquiry through that session, but he supposed, if the House had granted the Committee on his statement, and it had gone home, telegraphed by cable by the associated press, with which some hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to have mysterious connection—(*Laughter*)—it would also certainly have affected the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, throwing back for years the building of the railway, casting discredit on Canada, and telling British Columbia what they had told them two years before, that they were not going to get the railway.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not speak in his remarks on the motion, of facts within his own knowledge, and as the member for Marquette (Mr. Cunningham) had done in his statements of facts, he only stated that he was credibly informed that the fact existed, and he would be able to prove it, and I venture to say that in the whole range of Parliamentary experience in England, and

November 3, 1873

123

wherever else fair play is known, no man could be expected to have got any other answer than the one he got from the House.

If the hon. member had risen in his place and said of his own knowledge that he was personally cognizant of certain facts, then the House might have considered those facts as proved, at all events deficient for a *prima facie* case for inquiry, but the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) did not pretend to say so, but rose in the House and said he was credibly informed of certain facts, and thereupon asked for a Committee to try the Government, and not only so, but to try whether the legislation of the previous session was corrupt or non-corrupt; whether the members of Parliament who had voted for the Government were right or wrong, and whether that charter, to which great credit was attached, was fraudulent or valid. And on the nonce, when the hon. gentleman made the proposition, we resolved to leave it to the House to say whether they believed that the facts had occurred. When the hon. gentleman stated that he was credibly informed that such was true, the House voted down the motion.

On the next day I gave notice that I would introduce the resolution which I did introduce. I gave notice of the resolution, and there is a little history with the resolution to which I will call the attention of the House. It is reported that at a meeting at New Glasgow the hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) stated that that resolution which I moved was forced upon me by my own followers, and that members on this side of the House had come to me to urge me to introduce that resolution. The hon. gentleman had heard my denial. He heard my speech; he was in his place when I made that speech, and interrupted me several times, and I then turned round and asked my friends if any of them had come to me to force me by any influence, or language, or anything of the kind, to come down to the House with that motion. I should like to know the names of those eight members.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: I am quite satisfied I never mentioned eight names. (*Ministerial cries of "How many?"*) I said I was informed, as I was, that it was because of the pressure his supporters had brought to bear that an inquiry had been asked for next day.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Pictou): I wish to state what did occur at the meeting, and there will, I think, be no difference of opinion between the member for Lambton and myself as to the question of fact. The hon. member during his address stated that the leader of the Government was compelled by the pressure of his own friends in the House—I don't recollect that he stated eight members—to bring down the motion for a Committee to the House. I interrupted and said: "Why, did you not hear Sir John Macdonald declare that he did not introduce that resolution owing to the pressure of his friends or any friend?" The hon. gentleman replied: "I did not. I now declare he was pressed by his friends."

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: The statement made by the hon. member for Pictou is quite correct. I stated I had no recollection of

that statement being made, but as the hon. gentleman had said that it was made, I was bound to believe it, but I was still prepared to say that the information I had was that the leader of the Government was compelled by the pressure of his friends to make that motion. I am borne out in that by what the member for Shelburne (Mr. Coffin) stated the other day in the House. He for one was obliged to bring that pressure to bear the next day. (*Opposition cheers.*) I cannot recollect all the others, but I heard similar matters mentioned by some others.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have got the speech here, and before the debate closes I shall refer to it, because I do not like any misapprehension on these matters. I am satisfied the hon. gentleman said so, as he is reported, and I can state here that the hon. gentleman had his own reporter present. The hon. gentleman was reported to have said:—"I may inform the hon. gentleman there were eight of the Government supporters who put the screw on him." In other words—

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: I am perfectly certain I did not use the word screw.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: Now, I have occasion to repeat what I stated then, that no member of the Party, and not only no member of the Party, but not one of my own colleagues, spoke to me on the subject until I had announced my own determination. (*Loud cheers from Ministerial benches.*) The motion took us by surprise, and we met it, as I think we ought to have met it by voting it down.

Next day I came down late and walked into the Council room at half-past one. My colleagues were all sitting around. I said to them, after consideration: "I have made up my mind that I will move for a Committee," before any one had spoken. I had stated my intention without a single suggestion from any man, that as the charge was of such a nature that I would move for the appointment of a Committee and bring such motion before Parliament on the following day. And that is the way that the characters of men are lied away in this country. I do not mean to say that the hon. member for Lambton has lied down my character because he had denied it. What I do mean to say, it has been lied away by the mistake of a reporter who thought that he was reporting his words. I have now got the report here. It is from the *Halifax Citizen*. Perhaps the hon. member knows that his friend who formerly sat in this House for Halifax is the proprietor of this paper, or that he certainly writes for it. (*Hear, hear and cheers.*) Here is the newspaper, and if the hon. gentleman thinks I have made a mistake, and if he thinks I have done him an injustice perhaps he will be patient with me while I read the few sentences:—"Some gentlemen afterwards informed Hon. Sir A. John Macdonald that before they voted with him an inquiry there must be. He was then compelled to come down and say that he himself moved an inquiry on the following day."

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: What about the eight that the hon. member spoke of. (*Laughter.*) I refer to what the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Coffin) stated the other night.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: Does the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Coffin) say that he never came to speak to me on the subject?

Mr. ROSS (Victoria): I may say that two or three of us went to see the Ministers next day and stated that unless they promised a Committee themselves that was the last vote they would get from us.

Mr. CHURCH: I accept that statement. We saw the Hon. Mr. Mitchell on the following day and said the charges were very serious affairs, and that a Committee must be appointed.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: Thus we see another exemplification of the old story of the three Black Crows. (*Laughter.*) The hon. member stated that eight of my followers and supporters came to me and said that I must move that Committee. The hon. gentlemen say that they went to some one else, and I say, in the presence of my colleagues, that I myself went down to the Council and before having met or agreed with any single member of the Council, I said to them on going into the Council Chamber—“Gentlemen, I have made up my mind that on the first opportunity that presents itself I will move for a Committee to inquire into this matter.” (*Cheers.*)

I had had no communication with any member of the Government; no communication with any member of the House; no communication with any one in or out of the House, and therefore you can understand how guarded the hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) should be in giving publicity to other men’s affairs. He may perhaps have a vacancy in his memory. There is something, Abercrombie says, which leads men not only to forget certain facts and to state things as facts that never occurred. At all events, whether I was waited on by the eight members or not, I shall produce the hon. gentleman the report about the eight members before the night is over.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: I don’t care about it.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I know you don’t. I know the hon. gentleman is quite indifferent about the evidence that I can produce. (*Laughter.*) At all events I came down to Parliament and gave my notice of motion. Now I wish the House carefully to consider the circumstances under which I made my motion. I was of course exceedingly anxious that Sir Hugh Allan should succeed in his mission to England, and that the Pacific Railway should be preceded with without delay. I was anxious that no blow should be struck in this House for Party or any other purpose that could injure the prospects of these men in England, and yet I did not desire that there should be any undue delay in this inquiry, which affected the honour of hon. gentlemen and myself.

Now it must be remembered that my motion having been unanimously adopted by the House, was not only my motion, was not only my vote, but was also the motion and the vote of hon. gentlemen who were then members of this Parliament. I considered

at that time that the chances were infinitesimally small that these gentlemen would be back in time to go on with the inquiry before the prorogation of Parliament; and what did I move?

I moved “that a select Committee of five members be appointed of which committee the mover shall not be one,” and here, Mr. Speaker, I may perhaps bring in, *par parentheses*, a little remark. I moved that resolution as I thought that I, being one of the accused should not be a member of that Committee, and yet the hon. member for Shefford stated in a speech recently that if he had had his own way he would have been the Chairman of that committee; that he would have guided the deliberations of that Committee—he the accuser. The hon. gentlemen may think that I may have committed something like folly in this course, but, at all events, I moved that “a Committee of five members be appointed, of which the mover shall not be one, to inquire into and report on the special matters mentioned in the resolution of the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington), with power to send for papers and records, with power to report to the House from time to time, with power to report their evidence to the House from time to time, and if need be to sit after the prorogation of Parliament.”

I thought that by a mere lucky chance, by a mere fortuitous circumstance Sir Hugh Allan and his associates might perhaps raise the money, make the necessary arrangements and be back in time before Parliament was prorogued, and, therefore, I put in merely as an alternative that if need be the Committee could sit after Parliament was prorogued. I never thought for a single moment, it never occurred to my mind, that any man having a sense of justice would enter upon a trial of a matter, in the absence of those who were chiefly implicated, and perhaps you will say the Government were implicated, but at all events Sir Hugh Allan and Mr. Abbott were not only personally implicated, but their capital, their vested rights, their pledged faith were all interested in this inquiry, and I never thought any man would attempt such an effort of lynch law as to go on in the absence of Sir Hugh Allan, Hon. Mr. Abbott, and Sir George-É. Cartier; in the absence of all the evidence which these gentlemen could give on the subject of these charges.

I therefore, Sir, drew up the motion in the manner I have named, and I must confess that I am somewhat ashamed that my knowledge of Constitutional law should have been at fault; but I was anxious that the Government should not lie under the charges for a whole year, and I put that in the resolution in order that the Commission might sit from day to day during the recess, and if Sir Hugh Allan, Mr. Abbott and Sir George-É. Cartier arrived in this country that their evidence might be taken. This was my object in placing this clause in the resolution.

On the consideration we found that this House could not confer the power, and for a very substantial reason, because if this Parliament could appoint a Committee with power to sit during the recess it could also appoint a Committee of the whole House to sit during the recess, and thus the prerogative of the Crown to prorogue would be invaded, and Parliament as a committee of the Whole might sit indefinitely.

But I made a mistake; it was accepted by the whole House and hon. gentlemen who voted for my resolution are as much responsible for it as myself. Not only was my proposition considered, but it was weighed by the hon. member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake). So much did the hon. member for Bruce South consider it as a matter of certainty that the Committee must sit during the recess that he used this language:—"With regard to giving the Committee power to sit after the prorogation he thought the correct course to pursue would be to introduce a Bill authorizing the committee to sit during the recess, and by a resolution of the House to take evidence under oath."

The hon. gentlemen saw that it was quite impossible for us to get through the investigation during the session, and I do not see in justice how it was possible to get through without these gentlemen coming. Have I not then proved my case, Mr. Speaker? (*Cheers.*) Have I not proved that this House solemnly resolved, as far as it could resolve, that this inquiry should be continued after the prorogation?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall not elaborate this question any further than to say that believing as I did, believing as I do, that it would have been an injustice to proceed with this inquiry in the absence of the gentlemen whom I have named, the Government of which I am a member, offered the advice to the Governor General that the House should be prorogued on the 13th of August, it having been understood that in the intermediate time the Committee might sit. That advice was accepted, that was the advice I brought down and communicated to the House, and that advice was acted upon by this House, and that act this House cannot now re-call. (*Hear, hear.*) This House is responsible for its own acts, and ordinances, and when I announced here that the House would be prorogued on the 13th of August, this House accepted that proposition as it should have done. (*Cheers.*)

But, Sir, I stated to this House for all the purposes of this House that the adjournment should be considered a prorogation. (*Cheers.*) That was accepted by this House, and more than that, I brought down a bill to pay every member his salary on the ground that it was a prorogation, and I say further that any members who got this money and wished for more and came back to get it was guilty of taking money under false pretences. (*Cheers.*)

We know what has happened in the United States. We know that the *Globe* in order to induce its friends to come—they knew of course that my friends from the Pacific did not care for a thousand dollars, but they thought that the hon. members who were nearer Ottawa would be induced to come by a bribe, and the *Globe* to the eternal disgrace of that paper; insinuated that if hon. members came they would get their money. (*Cheers.*) And what would we have seen had this happened!

We would have seen in this country a repetition of the salary grab which is ruining so many men in the United States at this moment. The Congress of the United States passed a bill increasing the salaries of its members and providing that the members should get

their increased salaries, and for a time considerably anterior to that session; and what is the consequence? It has roused the people of the United States from one end to the other who were not easily roused by things of this kind, but it was such an evident grab by men to get money and put it in their pockets that it has sounded the death knell of many of them. The same would have been the certain fate of any man in Canada who had taken his money under these circumstances. (*Cheers.*)

I shall now make a few remarks in respect to the issue of the Royal Commission. I have spoken of the prorogation. I believe that it was constitutional. I believe that it was wise, and whether it was wise or unwise, it was sanctioned by this Parliament, and I know that Parliament cannot, without dishonour, reverse their vote; and I believe I know that the House accepted that prorogation on the ground that the adjournment was in effect to be a prorogation, and that only the two Speakers should be in the House on the 13th of August. (*Cheers.*)

As regards the legality of the Royal Commission, I believe that I need not speak so long on that subject. The motion of the hon. member for Lambton relieves me from that necessity. I will quote the evidence of the Royal Commission.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE: Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I hear the member for Bruce South say "hear, hear." Surely he ought not to touch, taste nor handle the unclean thing. (*Laughter.*) Surely he will not think that any good fruit will come from a vile stalk. Surely he won't quote any evidence of the Commission if he believes the evidence of that Commission to be illegal. The hon. gentleman is on the horns of a dilemma. Either the evidence is legal or illegal. If it is legal, then the House can judge from the evidence, but if it is illegal, the House must discard it; and yet the hon. member for Lambton quoted this evidence, and every man who spoke on the opposite side of the House used that evidence; and it cannot be said, if that evidence is to be used against the Government, that it is illegal or unconstitutional. (*Cheers.*) You have your money, and you take your choice. Either accept or discard it, and remain as you were before this evidence was taken. (*Cheers.*)

Now it was alleged in the argument of an hon. gentleman opposite, with respect to this Committee, that the Governor General had been snubbed. I tell the hon. gentleman, and I have the permission of the Crown to state it, that in addition to the official announcement, there is a formal opinion given by the law officers of the Crown,—those authorities whose opinion the hon. member for Bothwell looked so scornfully upon, but every one else so much respected—that the course taken by the Governor General both in respect to the prorogation and the issuance of the Royal Commission, was legal and constitutional.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE: Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: Well, Mr. Speaker I cannot help it if the hon. gentleman does not agree with the law officers of

the Crown. But I have still a further statement to make, and I think I may make it in the presence of my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Tilley)—that the course of the Governor General in respect to all these transactions has been finally settled and agreed upon by the whole Imperial Cabinet. (*Cheers.*)

It is said, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Commission that by constitutional authority the Crown cannot know what happens in the House of Commons. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the anachronisms which we see in the quotations of the hon. gentleman opposite. They are two or three centuries behind the times. In days long ago it was settled that no motion could be reported to the Crown; and why? Because in those days the Crown had a very inconvenient mode of sending down a number of officers and taking a member of Parliament by the neck and sending him to the Tower. So that it was told that during a discussion and for protecting the freedom of Parliament there should be no communication to the Crown while any discussion was going on, but it is different now. There can be no danger of any member of Parliament being seized in his place or out of his place. There is no danger of Charles the First coming down and seizing five members. There is no danger of the freedom of the members of Parliament, or of the people, being infringed by any Act of the prerogative.

What happened, however, in this case? Did the matter remain with the House alone, or conclude with the House? No, the House itself sent information to the Governor General by the member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington). In consequence of the resolutions passed by the House, the member for Cardwell (Hon. Mr. Cameron) introduced a bill for the purpose of giving the Committee power to administer oaths. We passed that bill through both House, and it went to the Crown, to the first branch of the Legislature. Is it to be supposed that when we, the advisers of the Crown, the advisers of the Governor General, asked him to come down here contrary to usual practice, contrary to the general universal practice, to come down before the end of the session to give his sanction to a measure; is it to be supposed that when we brought him down for that special purpose we were not charged by the Legislature to convey to him why we asked him to give his assent? Then why, Mr. Speaker, was it to be supposed that the Sovereign would give as a matter of course his assent to a measure passed by this Parliament without a reason.

Sir, we gave that reason. The advisers of the Crown told the Crown what the motion of the member for Shefford was. They told the Crown what the proceedings before the House were, and that the culmination of their proceedings was that the Act should be passed. That was the reason why the Crown came down, that was the reason why the Governor General instead of at the end of the session came down in the middle. He was fully informed of the motion of the member for Shefford, and of all the proceedings on which the bill was based. But it has been said, Sir, that this Act was an obstruction of the action of Parliament. Why Sir, it was intended for the purpose of aiding Parliament, but it was disallowed; but certainly by no act of mine as has been charged.

It was even asserted somewhere that I had, or that the Governor General had, attempted in some way to influence the Government in England to disallow the Act. Well, Sir, the paper before Parliament shows with what scorn that statement can properly be met. No suggestion direct or indirect, went from the Canadian to the Imperial Government with respect to the disallowance or passage of that act. (*Cheers.*) I did not hesitate in my place in Parliament to express my opinion that the passage of that Act was beyond the powers of the Canadian Parliament. I had formed, I may say, a very strong opinion on the point, but I did not express my opinion so strongly to this House as I really felt it, because I knew from the usual generosity of gentlemen opposite that they would at once have said, "Oh, of course, you throw obstacles in the way because you do not wish the bill to pass", and therefore while I would have liked to state that we had not the power to pass the Act, at the same time I placed great confidence in the opinion of the hon. member for Cardwell. I do not know whether the member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) expressed any opinion on the point, but if he did not, many other learned members did, and I paid great respect to their opinions. I did not therefore oppose, as otherwise I would have opposed, the passage of the bill, which I would certainly have done had I not been personally concerned.

When it went up to the Governor General, as the papers will show, as I was bound to express my real opinion, I stated my doubt of its legality, but hoped his Excellency would see his way to allow it instead of reserving it for the signification of her Majesty's pleasure, and I gave my advice not only as First Minister, but as Minister of Justice, that the Act should be passed. The measure was passed and went home to England and, as the despatches show, the case was fully argued, so far as it could well be argued, and the strong impression of the representative of our Sovereign at the time was, that I was wrong in my law, and that the hon. gentlemen who had supported the bill were right, and that the bill would become law. We know what the result was, and that after the consultations the bill was disallowed.

It has been said by the hon. member for Bothwell, that it is out of the question that we should be governed by the law officers of the Crown, but let me state to this House, Mr. Speaker, that the decision was not the decision merely of the law officers of the Crown, but it was the decision of the British Government. It was an order of the Privy Council, and there is an order of the Privy Council passed in which the Lord Chancellor is not consulted before a decision is come to. I state this without fear of refutation that any disallowance of an Act is not the act merely of the Attorney General and the Solicitor General, but that of the Government of Great Britain, the act of the Lord Chancellor at the head of the Privy Council. Will the hon. gentleman venture to deny; will he venture to say that for the disallowance of this bill we have not the highest authority, and that to which we must all bow, whether we will it or not? Will he venture to say that when an Act is disallowed by the Queen in Council it is the act of the Attorney General and Solicitor General, neither of whom is a member of the Privy Council or knows what the Privy Council does? They take their orders. They give their opinions; and these opinions may or may not be accepted by the

Government of the day; but in the case of the disallowance of this Bill there was the decision of the whole of the Government.

Mr. MILLS: Do not the Government in such matters always act on the opinions of the Solicitor and Attorney Generals?

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I can answer that promptly. The Government do not always so act. Frequently they act contrary to the opinions of those officers. I tell the hon. gentleman that the Lord Chancellor is the final adviser on such matters, and that in this case the Lord Chancellor, who is perhaps the first lawyer in England, and the Attorney and Solicitor Generals all agree.

Hon. Mr. WOOD: How does the hon. gentleman know that? It is not shown in the despatches.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I can tell my hon. friend at once that the action of the Attorney and the Solicitor Generals can have no effect on the Lord Chancellor, without whose assent no action of the Privy Council ever takes place. But, Sir, whether the Commission was legal or not, and we will suppose for a moment that it was not, though it is a great stretch of supposition, would it not have been well for the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) to have come before that Commission? Would it not have been well for the hon. member, as a man really anxious to have justice done? Would it not have been well for the hon. member if desirous of the triumph of his party, not desirous of the defeat of a Ministry, not desirous of a change of Government, not really, truly, anxiously, and, as he said, painfully desirous of having justice done, to have come before the Commission and have followed up the investigation from day to day? I think the House will say that the privileges of Parliament were not endangered, and that he might safely have prosecuted the matter and have brought the offenders to justice, and that he could have done so without prejudice to his position as a member of Parliament.

Why, it did not suit his game to come. It did not suit his plans to come. The hon. gentleman's game was first to destroy the Government and not to have a real inquiry into the conduct of the Administration.

Besides, Sir, and it is consideration of some importance to the House, and one that ought to have great force in the country, I myself, and the other members of the Government who were in this country desired to give our explanation under oath. I went there, Mr. Speaker, and you know it was said in the newspapers that the Commission would be a sham, and there would be no examination at all, and that the members of the Government and other witnesses would shelter themselves under the plea that they need not criminate themselves. I would ask you, Sir, and every hon. member, whether every member of the Government, when called before that Commission did not give full, clear and unreserved statements as regards all the transactions connected with the Pacific Railway. (*Cheers.*) As I believe that that Commission was issued in accordance with the law, because the Crown as such had a perfect right to enquire into that matter, so at the same time I believe that in

no way was it designed, and in no way did it in any way obstruct the action of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, this House is not governed by that Commission or the evidence, although the member for Lambton has quoted the evidence, and used it, and made it the basis of his motion. I say the House is not in any way bound by that Commission. It is in no way checked or obstructed or prevented from instituting the most searching examination into the matter. As a matter of fact, I believe that when the member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) made his charges here, there was a notice given in the Senate for an inquiry, and there was no reason in the world why the Senate should not have had an inquiry. They might have had a Committee, and, as we have often seen it in England, the two branches of the Legislature might have had concurrent committees sitting at the same time; and it might happen, as in England, that these committees might come to different conclusions. If a Committee had been granted by the Senate would that have been a breach of the privileges of this House? Certainly not. Well then Sir, if be not a breach of the privileges of Parliament that the second and third branches of the Legislature should have concurrent examinations into a certain charge, how can it be a breach of the privileges of the second and third chambers for the first branch of the Legislature to go into the matter. (*Cheers.*) If the Senate can discuss the matter cannot the Sovereign go into it?

Sir, the answer is too obvious to admit or doubt, and it must be remembered the Sovereign holds a two-fold position; that the Sovereign is not only the first branch of the legislature, and as such has a right to inquire into such matters, but is also the head of the executive and is the executive. The Crown governs the country; the Crown chooses its own Ministers, and this House has no control and the Senate has no control over the Crown in this respect except in deciding whether they have confidence in the Ministers chosen. The Crown in order to be a reality and not a myth, must have the full and sole selection of the individual members to form the Government, and it is then for Parliament to say whether that selection is such as will command the confidence of Parliament as well as enable them to carry on the affairs of the country.

If that is constitutional law, and I think it is, what is the consequence? Is that the Sovereign has the right to inquire into the conduct of its own officers. If an offence is committed the Crown has a right to enquire into it. If a charge is made the Crown has the right to ascertain whether that charge is true. I will suppose the case of a Minister charged with a crime amenable to common law. Could not the Crown make inquiry into such a matter? The proposition is too absurd a thing to need an answer, for we know of many cases where the Crown has made such inquiry.

The case that is most applicable in principle to the present one is that of Lord Melville, and I will refer to that because it lays down certain principles to which I would invite the attention of the House. The case is especially applicable because the matter was first discussed in the House of Commons; and it is said here that because the matter was first discussed in the House of Commons it should

end there, and no other tribunal should deal with it, and no other authority should intervene and prevent the House from concluding its inquiry. But there is no reason in the world why any independent authority should not pursue an independent inquiry, leaving to the House a full, unrestrained and unrestricted right of inquiry.

In the case I have mentioned there had been great abuses in connection with the Navy contracts in England during the Peninsular War and there were allegations of enormous frauds and a pledge was given by Mr. Pitt's Government of which Lord Melville was a member, that so soon as a peace was concluded an inquiry should be entered into as it was thought impossible that in the height of the war a proper inquiry could be made. I grant that it was a different Administration that moved for a Committee in the matter, but the motion was in consequence of the pledge given by Mr. Pitt, but when Lord Sidmouth asked for the Committee it was opposed in the House of Commons, on the ground that the Crown could prosecute the inquiry. The navy board had full authority, and the admiralty had full authority, and it was urged that the Crown as it appointed the judges so it should appoint Commissioners to try the particular case. There was the responsibility, and this view was argued strongly. As anyone will see who reads it, the Commission was only granted after the Government had been asked whether they had got their Commissioners, and after the House had been informed that the Navy board and the Government of the day asked for the Commission, and the Act to authorize the administration of oaths was passed because there was no power in the Navy Board to administer oaths. The commission was similar to this in all respects. On this the Minister was tried, and on this a Minister was acquitted, and the only difference between that case and this was that on that case a Commission was asked for by the Government, and in this the Commission was issued by the Government under the act.

Hon. Mr. WOOD: Whenever there were Commissions, special Acts were passed, authorizing these commissions.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: Would the hon. gentleman tell me of any such commissions?

Hon. Mr. WOOD: Yes, there was the Act of 1843 and the Act of St. Albans, and in 1852 a general Act was passed to such matters. No single case could be found in which a Royal Commission was appointed to try corrupt parties at elections, except under a special Act.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman cites certain acts relating to corrupt practices, but the hon. gentlemen must see that his cases had no reference to this one, because those which he cited referred to corruption in boroughs and the charge here is general corruption on the part of the Government. It had been contended by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who spoke at some length, that it was surprising that the witnesses before the Royal Commission did not know anything, that they came up one after another, telegraph operators and others, and all stated that they did not know anything about the matter. Why were they called? The reason was plain, and the reason was known to the hon. member. It was because Hon. Mr. Huntington (Shefford)

handed in the names of these witnesses to the Committee. He handed in my name among the rest, and it was alleged that there was an arrangement about this as if the Government had any control over that Commission.

The witnesses were called one after another and in the order shown on the list handed in by the hon. member for Shefford. Early in the session he handed in the list of witnesses, and they were all called in their sequence. I could not help it if a railway operator or a telegraph operator was called up and did not know anything about it. His name was there on the list, and in one case it was shown that Mr. Coursol, whose name was put on the list, met Hon. Mr. Huntington, and when he asked him why it had been done, that hon. gentleman said he did not know. It was the duty of the Commissioners to call upon every man that hon. gentleman had placed on the list, whether they knew anything or knew nothing, and therefore the charge of the hon. gentleman that they were called up by arrangement was untrue, and it was altogether unworthy of the hon. gentleman. Witnesses were called up as they came on the list, and as they came on that list they came up to give their evidence.

With respect to the composition of the Commission I have not much to say. It is beneath me to say much. (*Cheers.*) There is no man in Lower Canada who will not say that Judge Day, by his legal acquirements, was well fitted for the position, and when I tell you that the present Chief Justice on the Superior Court, Judge Meredith, has said that the greatest loss that the bench of Lower Canada ever had, was in Judge Day, I have said all that can be said. (*Cheers.*) Judge Day is a man above any charge of political bias. He has shown what he was on the Bench; he has shown that he was a politician; he has shown in the codification of the laws of Lower Canada what he was as a jurist. The hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) said that the other two judges were my creatures. He did not venture to attack Justice Day, but he attacked the other two.

Now, with respect to Mr. Justice Polette, I may say that I have not seen him, nor have I had any communication with him for seventeen long years. For seventeen long years he had been obliterated out of memory. I knew him in my early days in Parliament as a supporter of the Lafontaine-Morin Coalition. From that time he departed from my vision until he was appointed on that Commission. And why, Sir, why was he appointed on that Commission? I was resolved in consequences of the insult that had been heaped upon the Committee in Montreal that the Commissioners must sit in Ottawa, where they could be protected from such insults, and, therefore, there was no chance of the charge being tried by a Lower Canada Judge. I was anxious that there should be a Lower Canada Judge on the Commission. It was suggested by the *Globe* the no Superior Court Judge ought to sit on the Commission, as a cause might arise out of it yet which would have to be tried before them. I endeavoured, therefore, to carry out the suggestion. I thought it was a good one, and took Justice Day, who, as a retired Judge, could by no possibility try any case which might arise. He said that he would be only too glad to do so, but as

he was on very friendly personal relations with the Hon. Mr. Abbott, perhaps it might be thought not to be proper. He, however, consented to act. He also stated to me that at least one French Canadian Judge should sit, as one of my colleagues, a French Canadian, was implicated. He thought over all the names of the Judges of Lower Canada, and suggested to me the name of M. Justice Polette as a man of high standing, a man of great legal power, as worthy in all respects to take his seat on the Commission.

And it is said Mr. Justice Gowan was a creature of mine. How Mr. Justice Gowan ever came to be considered a creature of mine I cannot say. He commenced life as a partner of Mr. Small, and was an extreme Reformer. He was appointed by Mr. Baldwin on the representation of Mr. Small. I never did him a single favour that I know of. I did not appoint him a Judge. He was appointed a Judge before I was a member of Parliament, his appointment being made in 1843, while I became a member of Parliament in 1844. I afterwards became acquainted with Judge Gowan, and I found that he was a good lawyer. I may also say that I have received great advantage, and that the country has received great benefits from the services of Mr. Justice Gowan.

There is but one Judge of the Superior Court in Upper Canada whom I have not appointed or promoted, and that one Judge, I am proud to say, on the best evidence, has declared in the strongest terms that in this evidence produced before the Commission there is not one tittle of evidence against me. (*Cheers.*) It has been said that the Commission was a partisan Commission; but supposing I had committed any crime under the common law of the land, I must have been tried under a Judge who was appointed or promoted by myself; and I believe that not one single month or day less punishment would have been given to me if I had been tried by any one of these Judges whom I have been from my position instrumental in placing on the bench.

With respect to the charges brought against the Judges, they have assumed various phases. First we are told that the Government had acted with these American gentlemen and had given up all the rights of Canada to a foreign corporation. We were told that we are recreant to our position as Canadians, to our position as members of Parliament, and guardians of the rights of Canada, and that we had handed over the great Pacific Railway to the Americans. When that broke down, the next charge was bought up. Hon. gentlemen opposite said, "We know you did not do that but you have sold it" and then when that broke down they came to the last charge and said: "Oh, you are guilty of spending a large sum of money at the elections."

It has been attempted to be shown that the charge was not that the charter was sold to the Americans. He would ask this House if that was not the charge? (*Cheers.*) It was so understood in Canada; it was so understood in England; and it was attempted assiduously and insidiously to be spread through the country that the Government of Canada was devoid of principle and of patriotism, and that they had sold the charter to the Americans.

I must say that when this charge was first made it roused me. I had thought that I had thwarted these men in every particular. I had thought that I had kept Jay Cooke & Co. and Scott & Co., and every Company in any way connected with the Northern Pacific Railway, out of the Canadian Pacific Railway. (*Cheers.*) Mr. Speaker, if I had not done so; if I had gone into that moderate system; if I had allowed the American Railway system to go on and be completed, forever shutting out the opportunity for ours; if I had played the American game; if I had played the game of the hon. gentleman opposite; if I had sold the Railway; if I had sold the interests of Canada, I would have got the plaudits of the hon. gentlemen opposite instead of now getting their stabs. (*Cheers.*)

But it is because from the first to the last I was a true Canadian; because from the first to the last I stood by Canada; because from the first to the last, when they attempted to levy blackmail upon me, I put it down with a strong hand, that is why the attack was made on the Government; that is why the attack was made on me. (*Loud cheers.*)

I have no hesitation in saying that this course taken by the hon. member for Shefford is governed behind the scenes by a foreign element. (*Cheers.*) I do not charge the hon. gentlemen by whom he is surrounded with being parties to this, but I do say that the course of the hon. member for Shefford is governed by a foreign element, and I can prove it. (*Cheers.*) And if a Committee is granted to me, I will show that the hon. gentlemen sits here by virtue of alien money and influence, and not only by virtue of alien influences but alien railway influences. (*Cheers.*) I can prove it. I am informed, and I verily believe that I can prove it. (*Cheers and laughter.*) I have got evidence, and if a committee is given to me I can prove that the hon. gentlemen was elected to his seat in this House by alien railway influences, and more than that, I can not only prove that he was elected by alien railway influences but by alien railway influences not unconnected with the Northern Pacific Railway. (*Loud cheers.*)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to speak to the specific charges made against the Government. Sir, before the last elections took place, I knew what I had to face. I had a great, a strong and united opponent. I had showered upon my devoted head all kinds of opposition. I had been one of the High Commissioners, one of the signers of the Treaty of Washington. It was said that I had betrayed the country, and the hon. gentlemen had described me in their speeches as a cross between Benedict Arnold and Judas Iscariot. But I met Parliament, and by a calm explanation of my course I won the approval of the House. Still the Opposition roared.

I knew that I must meet with a strong opposition in my native Province from gentlemen of the opposite Party. That Province was the only Province in the country that was not a gainer by that Treaty, except as it was a gainer by the great gain which I think, over-balanced everything—that of a lasting peace between England and the United States. (*Cheers.*) It gave to our children, and to our children's children, the assurance that we could enjoy our own comfort, that we could enjoy our own firesides, that we could sit

under our own fig tree, without the possibility of the war cloud hanging over us; and if I was guilty of being a party to that Treaty, I shall be glad to have it recorded on my tombstone. (*Loud cheers.*)

We yielded much, we gave up many things—I admit that. I told this House that we had yielded much, that we had given up many things. But still we see our country prosperous, still we see every interest growing, (*cheers*) and now we know that by no hostile hand, by no unfriendly, warlike invasion, can the future be destroyed. (*Cheers.*) Yet, Sir, I went out and I submitted my shoulder to the smiter. I knew how much it would be held out that we had not got what we ought to have got; that we had got no reciprocity, that the wheat of the Western farmer was not exchanged on equal terms with the wheat of the Americans, but I had to meet that and I met it, Mr. Speaker, like a man. (*Cheers.*)

I had to meet much more. I had not only to be told, as I was told at every place that I went to, that I was a traitor and had sold this country. If Canada is never sold in the future by a greater traitor than myself, Canada will be a fortunate country. (*Loud cheers.*)

But I was told also that I had not only sold Canada to the Yankees, but that I had sold Ontario to the other Provinces. It was said that I had not only committed a great breach of international law, but had also given them more than their rights. On every question of constitutional law I have had the satisfaction of having the courts—well not perhaps the courts, but of those men who make the courts—in my favour, and I have never made a constitutional or legal proposition in which I have not had the support of the legal advisers of the Crown in England, and in which I have not been right, and the hon. gentlemen opposite have been wrong.

But with respect to Nova Scotia we were told, not only that my course was unconstitutional, but that we had given to Nova Scotia more than they had a right to have. Perhaps the hon. gentleman opposite would say they never said so, he had been in the habit of saying so; but the fact could be proved that the hon. gentleman took the two grounds, first that our action was unconstitutional, and, second, that the action was unjust to Ontario. (*Cheers.*) Now I would ask you to speak to every member from Upper Canada, and ask if they did not find in every election that said of the Government of Canada, and that I, as Prime Minister, had granted to Nova Scotia too much, and had thereby increased the taxation of the people of Ontario? I have had to tell the people of Ontario, in the first place that Nova Scotia only got justice, and in the second that the course taken was perfectly constitutional; and even if we had given Nova Scotia a little more than justice, it was well worth the outlay. (*Cheers.*)

Why, Mr. Speaker, what did we find at the time of the Union? The Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Tupper) was the first man returned to the House in the elections, on strictly Union principles. Consider the position we were in here. We were with a Constitution just trembling in the balance, and yet we found one of the most important Provinces recalcitrant, threatening independence, and

opposing in every possible way the carrying out of Confederation, under which we now live and flourish. Was I to deal with this question in a hesitating way? If we had given to Nova Scotia little more than her rights, and even as it were a sop, I say it was a statesmanlike act. But, Sir, there were no necessities of that kind. We did them simple justice; and I will venture to say that any member who will now sit down and read the discussions and negotiations between Canada and Nova Scotia, will feel that we did full and ample justice. I am no friend to doing half justice, but we did them no more than justice.

What is the consequence? We see the people, irrespective of Party; we see every man in Nova Scotia, admiring the legislation of Parliament introduced by the Government, which has made Nova Scotia a part of the Dominion, instead of being a separate Province and has converted it into one of the most ardent friends of Confederation among the whole of the different members of the Dominion. (*Cheers.*) If it shall happen, Sir as it may happen, that I receive a reverse, a condemnation of any particular act of mine, I may still appeal, and I do appeal, to the members for Nova Scotia, who, when their best interests were assailed, and they were brought perforce, *fas aut nefas*, into Confederation, they still got fair treatment, got full justice, at our hands and I hope to live in the hearts of the Nova Scotians. (*Cheers.*)

While that was satisfactory to me, I think it was not satisfactory to my friends in Ontario. Every man who supported me was attacked at the polls with respect to our action on the Washington Treaty, and because it was said we had given too much to help the Nova Scotians.

So with British Columbia. Let me read some of the resolutions with reference to the Pacific Railway and British Columbia. Do you suppose, does any man suppose, we could have British Columbia within the Dominion without a railway? There must not only be a Union on paper but a Union in fact. Those hon. members of the Opposition by every act that they could, in every way they could, opposed the practical Union of British Columbia with Canada. (*Cheers.*) They voted against it, they said it was most outrageous, the plan, the idea of a Railway, was outrageous. (*Opposition cries of Hear.*) That is the language used by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I will presently quote the terms used.

Now let us look at some of the motions made. The Government moved a motion to carry out the measure which is now the law. It was moved in amendment “that the proposed engagement respecting the Pacific Railway would, in the opinion of the House, press too heavily on the resources of Canada to carry out.” That motion was defeated. (*Ministerial cheers.*) Then it was moved “that in view of the arrangement entered into with British Columbia at the time of Confederation, and the large expenditures necessary for canal improvements and other purposes within the Dominion, this House is not justified in imposing on the people the enormous burden of taxation required to construct within ten years a railway to the Pacific, as proposed by the resolution submitted to this

House.” (*Ministerial cheers.*) I say I might read you a series of resolutions, all made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and voted for by them, showing that in their opinion we had been overtaking the resources of the people of Canada.

I am now told by hon. gentlemen opposite that, although they opposed that arrangement with British Columbia, they think they are bound to it now. I am told that they say, “True, we made an arrangement with British Columbia which was improvident, extravagant and ruinous, and which could never be carried out. Yet, being made, we will carry it out.” I don’t exactly see the logic of that. If it be ruinous, extravagant and impossible, I really don’t see how it can be carried out now. (*Cheers.*) But, Mr. Speaker, I don’t believe the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite is in favour of that. (*Loud cheers.*) I know it is opposed to that. (*Renewed cheers.*) I know if this Government goes out of office and another Government comes into power, if it be composed of hon. gentlemen opposite, that it will oppose our policy in this question. (*Ministerial cheers.*) Hon. gentlemen opposite dare not deny that the *Globe* newspaper announces and directs their policy.

We passed a bill the session before last; we granted a charter for the building of the road, and it was settled and determined that the Pacific Railway should be built, and we were to build it on our own territory, and not allow the Yankees to come in and assist the hon. member for Vancouver (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks). Yet what was the announcement of the organ of the hon. gentlemen opposite? After the Legislation of 1872, after we had accepted the arrangement with British Columbia, after we had brought them into the Dominion on the pledge of the faith of the Government and the country, that there would be a Pacific Railway within ten years, after we had made that promise, with the solemn sanction of the country, what were the remarks of the *Globe*, the exponent of the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite?

The right hon. gentleman then read an extract from an article, published in the *Globe* during 1873, wherein the Pacific railway scheme was declared to be financially ruinous and politically unpatriotic; a scheme which could only be accomplished within the ten years at an outlay which would cripple Canadian resources, and lock up the most valuable part of our public domains.

Now Mr. Speaker, you see what is to happen if Canada builds this Canadian Pacific railway. All our resources are to be crippled by this, the most ruinous and most unpatriotic scheme ever invented, and this cry I had to meet at the hustings. I have gone on from one stage to another. I have shown you how I met the cries of the hustings—that I had bartered away Canadian rights in the Washington treaty, that I had granted too much to Nova Scotia; that I had been guilty of granting a constitution to a few half-breeds in the North-west country, and had given them infinitely more than they had a right to expect; that as regards British Columbia, I would throw away the resources of Canada upon the construction of the Pacific Railway, and that I had sold Ontario. (*Ironic cheers from the Opposition.*)

Mind you, Ontario considers itself the richest Province, and no doubt it is, and that any additional charge placed in the public Treasury presses unfavourably on them, because they pay more in proportion to their wealth than the other Provinces of the Dominion. I know they don’t do so, but it has been urged upon them that they do so.

Then again, we had to meet the continued opposition of the Local Government of Ontario. I will give the hon. gentlemen proofs in writing, so that they will not be able to deny the fact—proof that though that Local Government had pledged itself in the most formal manner to be neutral in the contest; that they, by every act in their power, and by every influence direct and indirect that they possessed, worked against the Canadian Government. That is the charge and I can prove it. (*Ministerial cheers.*) We knew that influences of every kind would be used and were used, which can be proved, or as the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) would say, “I am credibly informed and can prove,” (*laughter*), and we believed that the future of Canada much depends upon the continuing in power of a Government that has for its one single aim and object the maintenance of the connection between Canada and the British Empire, and the promotion of the development of the Dominion itself. (*Cheers.*)

We have been met at the polls with sectional cries. If the Opposition could raise a religious cry it was done. The New Brunswick school question was brought up, and they got up the cry that we had given too much to Nova Scotia, and those cries were made to ring at the polls in Western Canada. The cry that we had given too much to British Columbia was hammered into us at every public meeting in the west, and I say distinctly, and I repeat it again, that we had the power, influence, and the weight of the Ontario Government against us, contrary to the distinct pledge that the Government would be neutral. (*Cheers.*)

Well, Sir, I will state now what occurred with respect to the Pacific Railway. I was at Washington bartering my country as some of the hon. gentlemen say, (*laughter*) attending at all events to the Washington treaty, when the resolutions were carried which happily I say for Canada, brought British Columbia into the union of the British North American Provinces. (*Cheers.*) The proposition included the Pacific Railway, for British Columbia would not have come in, unless the terms of the union had included a railway. Notwithstanding great opposition the resolutions were carried by my late honoured and lamented colleague, but he only carried them by promising to introduce resolutions by which the railway would be built, not by the Government directly, but by private capital, aided by Government grants.

I would not, if I had been here, have willingly assented to that proposition, but though I was not here yet I am responsible for that act, and I do accept it as perhaps the best proposition to be had; otherwise, perhaps, the Union would not have been consummated. The resolutions declared that the Railway should be built by a Railway Company assisted by Government grants of land and

money. The hon. member for Napierville (Hon. Mr. Dorion), however, moved a resolution setting forth that the House did not believe that private capital could be obtained sufficient for the purpose. The whole of the resolutions moved by hon. gentlemen opposite were more for the purpose of defeating the construction of the Pacific Railway; and when Sir George-É. Cartier produced his resolutions and was about to carry them as prepared, he had to give way to the desire of the House, because even those who usually supported the Government were alarmed at the cry which had been raised by gentlemen opposite. Thus if the motion of the hon. member for Napierville had been adopted and Canada was unable to get a Company to build the Railway, the bargain with British Columbia would fall to the ground and be only waste paper and British Columbia would sit out shivering in the cold forever without a Railway.

The policy indicated by that solution of the hon. member for Napierville has been carried out ever since. In March, long after the legislation had taken place, by which Parliament declared that there should be a Pacific Railway built in some way or other, we find the *Globe* urging its friends to still further oppose that scheme; and, Sir, we have had arraigned against us the opposition of those who usually ally themselves against the Government, supported by those gentlemen of the Opposition, many of whom owe their elections to sectional cries. (*Cheers.*) We have met them, and it is said we met them with money. I believe that the gentlemen opposite spent two pounds to our one. (*Opposition cries of no, no.*)

I challenge the hon. gentlemen to have a Committee on this subject. Let us have a Committee. (*Ministerial cheers.*) I read the speech of the hon. member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) at London, and he suggested the appointment of a Statutory Committee. In God's name let us have it! Let us have a Committee of three, to go from county to county, from constituency to constituency, and let them sift these matters to the bottom, and I tell you on my honour as a man, that I believe I can prove that there are more who owe their elections to money on that side of the House than on this. (*Loud Ministerial cheers.*) If I be challenged I can go into detail. I can show, and I can prove it that many members owe their election to money, and to money alone. I challenge the hon. gentlemen to agree to the appointment of a Committee, a Statutory Committee, as suggested by the hon. member for Bruce South. Let us put the names of the Judges of all the Provinces into a bag, and draw out three names, who shall form the Committee. (*Cheers.*)

As I stated in my evidence, and I hope my evidence has been carefully read by every member of this House, and I say here that I tried to be as full and as frank as I could well be. I could not help it if I was not subjected to a rigid cross-examination. I was exceedingly anxious that the hon. member for Shefford should be there to cross-examine me—(*cheers*)—and I would willingly have answered his questions. I have little more to say than I said then.

Sir, there was no sale to Sir Hugh Allan of any contract whatever. (*Cheers.*) Consider for one moment, Mr. Speaker, how the case stood. Parliament had passed two Acts, one for Upper Canada and

one for Lower Canada, and some two or three subsidiary Acts respecting branch lines. But we will leave these out of the question, and will consider that there were two Acts passed, one for a Company having its centre in Montreal, and the other in Toronto. Now, Sir, although there were Ontario gentlemen connected with the Canada Pacific Company, and although there were Quebec gentlemen connected with the Interoceanic Company yet they were really Acts promoted by men who have Ontario and Quebec interests only, and every one saw that they were essentially sectional.

Before Parliament met, and before either Act was passed, the cry was got up that the Northern Pacific people were desirous of obtaining the control of our railway. At the first, Mr. Speaker, when the first interview took place between the Government and these gentlemen, I was very glad to see them. We had passed in 1871 the Act that British Columbia should be a portion of the Dominion, and we had passed the resolution by which we were to build the railway in ten years. It was understood, then, Sir, that the whole matter should stand over until the ensuing session, and that in the meantime the Government should go on with the survey and be ready in 1872 with the plans. We got through the session of 1872 and we commenced, in order to keep faith with the British Columbians, the survey, and I think they will admit, and everyone must admit, that the greatest energy and the greatest zeal has been exhibited in the survey, and that within two years there has never been so much work so satisfactorily done as in this railway survey by Mr. Sanford Fleming. (*Cheers.*) The survey was going on, and in midsummer and in the fall all the members of the Government were scattered looking after their several affairs, taking their little holidays, and God knows the public men of this country have little enough holiday.

They were all scattered except Hon. Sir Francis Hincks and myself when Mr. Waddington called on me. I had known the gentleman before, and I much respected him. He said to me that there were some American gentlemen to see us about the railway. I said to him in my way, "What a fool you were to bring them here. We can do nothing with them." He was very much distressed, and said to me, "But you will not refuse to see them." I said certainly not.

The gentlemen then came, and Hon. Sir Francis Hincks and I met them, and we talked pleasantly, and I said to them that I was glad to see that American capital was looking for investment in Canadian enterprises, but that it was altogether premature as we could not then take any offers or suggestions, or take any action till after we had met Parliament. One of them remarked that they had evidently been brought on a wild-goose errand, and they then went away.

This first brought to my mind very strongly the necessity for looking out for our railway. Parliament had tied down our hands and the railway could only be built by a company, and there were no other means of carrying out the pledge with British Columbia, and I therefore immediately addressed myself to the matter. And what did I do? I spoke to all that I could, as I have no doubt my

colleagues did, and endeavoured to arouse Canadians in the enterprise. I went to Toronto and saw Messrs. Macpherson, Gzowski, Col. Cumberland, Mr. Howland and his son, and Gooderham & Worts, and in fact every one, and endeavoured to induce them to enter into the great enterprise. I told them, as Hon. Sir Francis Hincks told Sir Hugh Allan, that by law there was no other way of building the road but by a company, and that they ought to get up a grand company, get a charter and go to England for any capital they needed.

As I went to Toronto, Hon. Sir Francis Hincks went accidentally to Montreal, and told Sir Hugh about the American gentlemen who had called on us, and the fault I found with my friend Sir Francis, and which I ventured to tell him when he was a member of the Government was, that while merely attempting to stimulate Sir Hugh to go into the work, he had named to him that he had better put himself in communication with the American capitalists. That was the act of Hon. Sir Francis Hincks. That was his concern, and I would not at all object to American capital, or capital from England, or anywhere else, but I told Sir Francis on his return that he had been premature in this, that we ought to have kept to a great Canadian Company before any offer or intimation that Americans might come in was made.

Then Sir Hugh, acting on the hint given by Sir Francis, and it was no more than a hint—it was in no way a Government action—communicated with the Americans, and we had a visit from a number of Americans with Sir Hugh; and Mr. Speaker, I being spokesman on both occasions, gave them precisely the same answer that they were premature; that we were very glad to see them, but we could make no arrangement until Parliament met. I said we would be very glad, however, to hear any proposition, and asked them whether they had any to make. Sir Hugh asked in return whether we were in a position to entertain a proposition; and on our replying in the negative, he rejoined that he had no proposition to make. And these were all the communications between the Canadian Government and these gentlemen. (*Cheers.*) This statement cannot be controverted, and will not be.

In the meantime a sectional jealousy had arisen, instead of, as I had hoped, a joint action between the capitalists of Montreal and Toronto, and instead of, as I had hoped, there being a rush and anxiety among our moneyed men in the different parts of Canada to form one great Company, for the work required united exertion, there was a jealousy fanned from some quarter, which we know now, and this jealousy prevented the two great bodies of capitalists, who ought to have built the road, from joining, and all our hopes were scattered; and a feeling arose in Toronto first, that if the Montreal interest got the preponderance Toronto trade would get the go-by, and second, that Sir Hugh Allan and the Montreal interests were joined with the Americans.

That feeling grew and I am not now in a position to state, after reading the evidence and after reading the letters of Sir Hugh Allan and those published by Mr. McMullen, I am not now in a position

to state that jealousy in Toronto was ill founded. I am not in a position to state that they had not some ground of which we knew nothing for believing that the Montreal party were in communication with the Americans. I am not now in a position to state that the people of Toronto and the Interoceanic had not great cause for suspicion and jealousy, whether that suspicion was well or ill founded; but before Parliament met, as I have sworn and as Mr. Abbott has sworn and as every member of the House knows, the feeling against the introduction of American capital was so great that by no possibility could it be allowed entrance.

We felt, Mr. Speaker, and every member knew it, that it was necessary that every American element must be eliminated from the Acts, or they could not pass—(*cheers*)—and I appeal to hon. gentlemen who were then in the House if they do not know, as a matter of fact, that it was understood on all sides that the American element was eliminated. I understood it so; the Government understood it so, and the House understood it so, and Mr. Abbott, who undertook the management of the bill of the Montreal Company through this House, made it a special understanding with Sir Hugh Allan that it should be so before he promoted the bill, and so it was by universal consent.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that it will be said, and I may as well speak of it now, that Sir Hugh Allan's letters show that he still kept up his connection with the Americans. I knew it, and I painfully know it, that Sir Hugh Allan behaved badly and acted disingenuously towards the men with whom he was originally connected. I say that when he found that Americans were not to be admitted he ought to have written to them, and informed them that though he had made a contract with them, still so strong a feeling existed in Canada that he must at once and forever sever his connection with them.

Instead of doing so, however, he carried on a correspondence with them, a private correspondence which he has sworn no one else saw, and which he has sworn that not even his colleagues in the Canada Pacific Company knew of, not even Mr. Abbott, his confidential adviser. He says he conducted it as his own personal affair, believing and hoping that in the end the people of Canada would come to a different view, and allow American capital to be used. He has sworn that, and we never knew that he was carrying on communications with the Americans. Mr. Abbott never knew it and the Canada Pacific Company have declared that there was no connection between them and the Americans, but I have heard it said, I think, by the member for Châteauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton), is it possible that the Government would give a contract to a man who had behaved so disingenuously, and after this want of ingenuousness had been shown to the Prime Minister, by the exhibition of the correspondence?

Sir, let me say a word about that. After the Act passed and we were working with all our might to form a good company and a strong one, long after, Mr. Speaker, as it appears in the correspondence between Sir Hugh Allan and the Americans, Mr. McMullen came to my office in order to levy blackmail.

(*Cheers.*) He did not show me the correspondence but he flourished certain receipts and drafts which Sir Hugh had drawn at New York. There was nothing, however, in that because he had told us he had gone into that association, and we knew that he had communication with the Americans, and there was nothing extraordinary in my seeing that these gentlemen had subscribed a certain sum of money for preliminary expenses, and I have never known a Company, railway of otherwise, without preliminary expenses being provided for by the promoters. I told Mr. McMullen, therefore, that it was his matter, and that he must go and see Sir Hugh.

I heard no more about the matter until late in January or February, after we had formed the Company, after a correspondence with every Province of the Dominion, after having tried to excite and having successfully excited the capitalists of the different Provinces to subscribe, after we had got everything prepared, after I had drafted the charter and the great seal only required to be affixed, and just when the charter was about to be launched, and the Company to build the road was about to be made a certainty, then Mr. C.M. Smith, Mr. Hurlbut and Mr. McMullen walked into my office.

I do not say that Mr. Smith or Mr. Hurlbut came to levy blackmail. I do not think they did, for they looked respectable gentlemen, and spoke and behaved as such. They told me Sir Hugh Allan had behaved very badly, and they read a good deal of the correspondence which had been published, and I told them then, "Gentlemen if your statement is true, Sir Hugh Allan has behaved badly towards you, but the matter is your own, and Sir Hugh is no doubt able to meet you." They spoke of the seizing of his ships and bringing actions against him both in the United States and Canada, when I repeated to them that they had their proper remedy, and added that Sir Hugh had not the slightest power to give them the contract. (*Cheers.*) I told them that he ought to have broken off his connection with them long ago, and that if he had kept them in the dark they must take their own remedy against him.

We were then asked how could we admit Sir Hugh into the contract. Mr. Speaker, we had already admitted him. The contract was made. Every Province had been given its Directors. The charter had been drawn, and only waited the signature of the Governor General; and more than all this, the correspondence, whatever may be said of the conduct of Sir Hugh Allan towards the Americans, proved the existence of hostility between them, and showed that if Sir Hugh were one of the Company who received the contract, we should keep the Americans out altogether.

I had to get that contract let. I had to get a sufficient number of the capitalists of Canada who would take up this subject, and Sir Hugh Allan was the first. He is our greatest capitalist. He was the first man who went into it, and these gentlemen, Mr. McMullen and the rest, proved to me that Sir Hugh Allan had cut the cord of connection, had nothing to do with the Americans, or with Jay Cooke & Co., and that they were resolved to follow him to the death as they had done. (*Hear, hear.*) This, then is the narrative, so far, of our connection with the Pacific Railway.

My evidence states that shortly before the elections I went to Toronto, and Sir George-É. Cartier went to Montreal. I do not wish hon. gentlemen to suppose for one single instant that I would desire to shelter myself or my living colleagues by throwing the blame on my dead colleague. (*Cheers.*) Whatever Sir George-É. Cartier has done I will assume the responsibility of. (*Hear, hear.*) Whatever Sir George-É. Cartier has done I must accept as being the honest expression of an individual Minister; but, sir, I do not admit, and I will not admit, and it is not safe for hon. gentlemen opposite to admit, that any one Minister can bind a Ministry. (*Cheers.*)

I went to Toronto in order to descend to the stern contest that was forced upon me by the course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, to meet the arguments that were going to be used against me, the sectional questions that were raised against me, the numerous charges which were made against me, and which I had always found operating against me. When I went to Ontario for that purpose, and to meet these charges, it was not for the first time. As long as I have been in Parliament I have been charged by hon. gentlemen opposite with selling Upper Canada, with sacrificing the best interest of Upper Canada, with selling myself to French domination and Catholic influences and Lower Canadian interests.

I had refuted these charges repeatedly, and had convinced the majority in Upper Canada that I held then as I do now the principle of union between Upper and Lower Canada, and that the only way by which that union could be firmly established was by ignoring sectional questions and religious differences. (*Cheers.*) These cries are still raised. You will hear them before many days in this House, and you will hear them throughout the country whenever it pleases hon. gentlemen opposite to raise them; but as my past history has shown, so my future history will prove that whatever party political exigency may be, I have never, and shall never give up the great principle of keeping intact the union of Upper and Lower Canada by a give and take principle, by a reciprocity of feeling and by surrendering our own religious and political prejudices for the sake of Union.

I went to the West to do what I could during the elections, in fighting the battle of the party and the Government. I had simply said to Sir George-É. Cartier that I should have a very hard fight in Upper Canada, as I had the Government of Ontario against me, and I wished him to help me as far as he could. I went to Toronto, and I tried all I could before the elections took place to procure an amalgamation of the two Companies.

It was of vital importance, in a Party point of view, laying aside the patriotic view, to have a Company to build the road, composed of the Montrealers and the Toronto men, so that I could have gone to the country and said, "Here is a great enterprise. We have formed a great Company. We are carrying out a great scheme. We are forming a great country." I spared no pains to procure an amalgamation; Senator Macpherson, and any one in Toronto connected with the enterprise, will tell you how hard, how earnestly, in season and out of season, I worked to procure that amalgamation. I failed. I thought I had succeeded two or three

times. I abandoned my own constituency; I might have been elected by acclamation, or at all events by a very large majority, but instead of attending to my election I went up to Toronto to attempt to bring about an amalgamation between the two companies. Then they got up a story about me, according to the habit of the Opposition that I considered my constituency a pocket borough, and thought I could afford to pass it by.

I thought at one time I had succeeded in procuring an amalgamation, and Mr. Abbott came up to Toronto in response to a telegram from me. We had an interview with Mr. Macpherson, and almost succeeded in coming to an agreement. The only question was whether there should be seven and six or five and four directors from Ontario and Quebec. The arrangement was so near that I was satisfied when I left Toronto that the amalgamation was complete. I found, however that that was not the case, and in the middle of my election on the 25th, I think, of July, I telegraphed to Mr. Macpherson to come down, and he came down to Kingston and saw me and then I sent that telegram which had been published in the papers, and which was the only arrangement as regards the granting of the charter so far as the Government were concerned, so far as I was concerned. (*Hear, hear.*) That telegram which was sent on the 26th of July was sent by me to Sir Hugh Allan after seeing Mr. Macpherson, and with the knowledge of Mr. Macpherson.

Now what does that say? I was obliged reluctantly to give up the hope of having an amalgamation before the elections. These little jealousies, these little personal ambitions and the jostling between seventeen and thirteen members on the board had come in the way, and I could not carry out the arrangement I had hoped to complete. I could not spare the time. I was in great danger of losing my election by throwing myself away on this great Pacific Railway. I actually came down to Kingston only on the day of my nomination, trusting to the kindness of my old friends in Kingston.

Well, Sir, what was the telegram which I sent? It said: "I have seen Mr. Macpherson"—he was in the room when I wrote it. "I have seen Mr. Macpherson. He has no personal ambition, but he cannot give up the rights of Upper Canada. I authorise you to state that any influence the Government may have in the event of amalgamation, shall be given to Sir Hugh Allan. The thing must stand over till after the elections. The two gentlemen, Mr. Macpherson and Sir Hugh Allan, will meet in Ottawa and form an amalgamation."

That was the proposition which I made, and just think, Sir, what was involved, think how much I was snubbing, which is a word which had been used by the *Globe* lately, how much I was injuring and prejudicing the interest of my colleague in Montreal, Sir George-É. Cartier. Sir Hugh Allan did not care so much for the Pacific Railway, and Sir George-É. Cartier did not care so much for Sir Hugh Allan. It was not Sir Hugh Allan or the Pacific Railway that he cared so much about; but Sir Hugh Allan had made himself the representative man of Lower Canada with respect to the Northern Colonization Road, the North Shore Road, and the Ottawa and Toronto Road, so that the members from Lower Canada would

have stood by Sir Hugh Allan even to the risk of losing all the elections, because their Montreal interests would be so much affected if Sir Hugh Allan were not sustained with regard to the Pacific Railway.

But with respect to the other railways, my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Beaubien) and other gentlemen can say that if there had been accord between Sir Hugh Allan and the French members of Lower Canada from the Montreal district there would have been a great peril of the Lower Canadian members from that district deserting Sir George-É. Cartier, and supporting Sir Hugh Allan in carrying out the Northern Colonization road.

I was standing by Sir George-É. Cartier, who was most improperly charged with being so much attached to the Grand Trunk Railway that he would not do justice to the other roads. I will ask my friends from Lower Canada if Sir George-É. Cartier's connection with the railway had anything to do with the result of the elections. His prospects were connected with the local roads alone. In order to prove to you how true a man Sir George-É. Cartier was, how perfectly unselfish he was, I may state that he held back on my account. When he said, "I wish to be elected on my own merits, and on my own services, and not on account of the Colonization or any other road," (*cheers*) and when by a word he could have put an end to the cry of interest, he felt that it was a sectional feeling between Upper and Lower Canada, and that if he pronounced in favour of any railway in Lower Canada, he would injure me in Upper Canada, and he sacrificed himself for my sake in Lower Canada, because he thought that any pronouncements in favour of Sir Hugh Allan, might injure me and my friends in the western elections. (*Cheers.*) I had only one thing to do and that was to return to him the confidence and trust he had reposed in me. I said "Don't mind me. Fight your own battles. You must make your own arrangements with your friends in respect to the railways," and it was not until he had that communication with me that he said he would help the Northern Colonization road.

It was not because Sir George-É. Cartier had any personal objects to gain, it was not because he was connected with the Grand Trunk Railway, but it was purely from a desire to save me from any possible difficulty in Upper Canada that he held back, and I have here now, when he is dead, the proud opportunity of stating that even in the last moment he was actuated by no selfish feelings, by no desire to promote his own interests, but that he only thought of his colleague, of his comrade of twenty years. He only thought that by appearing to promote a national interest in Lower Canada he might hurt me in Upper Canada and he threw away all his chances, all his hopes, everything like a certainly or a reasonable hope of success, for the purpose of standing by me, and I am proud and happy now to pay this tribute to his memory. (*Cheers.*)

Well, Sir, on the 26th of July I sent a telegram, and that was the only bargain. No man can make a bargain with the Government, except by an Order in Council, or by the action of the First Minister, recognized and accepted by his colleagues. Any act of a First Minister until it is disavowed is considered equal to a minute

of council, equal to an Act of the Government. That telegram of mine of the 26th of July was an Act of Government. My colleagues have not repudiated it; they have accepted it, and was a fair arrangement as we could not get the amalgamation.

As we could not succeed in going to the country with a perfect scheme for building the Pacific Railway, what else was left to us but to keep the amalgamation of these great capitalists open till after the elections, and then call them together, and the only word of preference for Montreal over Toronto was simply my expression that any influence the Government might have in case of amalgamation, in the case of the two Companies joining and electing a Board of Directors, would be fairly used in favour of Sir Hugh Allan for the Presidency. I think that was due to Sir Hugh Allan, and after all it was no great affair. Everybody knows that the President of a Company is no more than the junior member of the Board of Directors. It depends altogether upon the personal weight of the man. We have seen Boards where the President governed the Board; others where the President was a mere figure head, and others again where the junior member governed the Company. It depends entirely upon the personal figure and authority of the man.

Well, Sir, I made that promise, but I wish the House to remember that at the time of that telegram, in which I simply stated that as we could not form a Company before the elections, we would form one afterwards out of the two, and would do what we could to make Sir Hugh Allan President. At that time there had been not one single word said about money—(*cheers*)—and there never was one said, as far as I was concerned, between Sir Hugh Allan and me. (*Hear, hear.*)

I was fighting the battle in Western Canada. I was getting subscriptions, as I have no doubt the hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) was getting subscriptions, and if he denies it I will be able to prove it. (*Cheers.*) I state in my place that I will be able to prove it. (*Cheers.*) I was doing what I could for the purpose of getting money to help the elections, and I was met, not only by individual exertions, but by the whole force, power and influence, legitimate and illegitimate of the Ontario Government. I have no hesitation in saying that in all expenditure, we were met by two dollars to one. (*Hear, hear.*) I have read with some amusement the attacks that have been made upon the Government, because a member of the Government was a party to this fund. If we had had the same means possessed by hon. gentlemen opposite; if we had spies; if we had thieves; if we had men who went to your desk, picked your lock and stole your note books, we would have much stronger evidence than hon. gentlemen think they have now. (*Cheers.*) We were fighting an uneven battle. We were simply subscribing as gentlemen, while they were stealing as burglars. (*Cheers.*) We may trace it out as a conspiracy throughout. I use the word conspiracy advisedly, and I will use the word out of the House as well as in the House. (*Cheers.*)

The hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) said that he had obtained certain documents. He attempted to read them to this House, not much I think to his credit, and certainly contrary to

the sense of the House and of the country. Now how did he get these documents. We had Mr. George W. McMullen, who was the American agent of these gentlemen. He had carried on this correspondence with Sir Hugh Allan, and when he came to me in December and tried to levy blackmail on me (*hear, hear*) I told him to go—well I did not use any improper language, but I told him to step out of my office, (*Laughter and cheers*) and he went to the hon. gentlemen opposite. (*Cheers.*) This is no mere hypothesis of mine. Sir Hugh Allan had promised to pay this man \$17,000 for these papers, and although he had the money almost in his hand, the hon. gentlemen gave him something more. (*Cheers.*) The hon. gentlemen cannot deny that he did.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: I do deny it. (*Opposition cheers.*) The statement is without foundation.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: If there is one person in the world whom the hon. member for Shefford had as a friend, it is the editor and proprietor of the Montreal *Herald* (*hear, hear*). I think he takes him to his bosom. I think they sleep together. I think that they have but one thought. He is a guide, philosopher, and friend, and when we have the announcement from the Montreal *Herald*, of May the 22nd, 1873, I think we must accept it. "No one can suppose that such a plot could have been laid bare without great labour and large expenditure," (*cheers*) again, the *Herald* says, speaking of Hon. Mr. Huntington,—“But for the courage with which he assumed it, as well as for the pains and expenditure which it has cost him to expose the mystery, he is entitled to the warmest gratitude.” (*Cheers on both sides of the House.*) I judge from the cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite that the hon. member for Shefford has their thanks; but that is an admission that he made the expenditure. (*Oh! oh! and cheers.*) This man bought Mr. McMullen. It is admitted by the Montreal *Herald* that he bought him. (*No! no! and hear, hear.*)

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: I have already stated in the House that the charges were not founded on any information from Mr. McMullen, and that the statements which have appeared were false. I never got any information from McMullen till long after I made the charges. I never paid nor promised him a cent, and the statement of the hon. gentleman is utterly without foundation. (*Opposition cheers.*)

The statement also that he made a few minutes ago that I have been influenced here by foreign gold, and that foreign gold had been used in my election, is an utterly unfounded statement, false in every particular; and I challenge the hon. gentleman to the combat, and dare him on his responsibility to take the Committee. (*Hon. Mr. Huntington was proceeding, when cries of "Order!" were raised on the Government benches, answered by Opposition cheers. The hon. gentleman went on speaking in the midst of an uproar which rendered his remarks perfectly inaudible.*) On order being restored,

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD preceded. There, Sir, it is very evident that I have hit the spot; that I have hit him on a sore

point. (*Cheers and No! no!*) I have told the hon. gentleman that I am willing to have a Committee to inquire into the whole matter, including the case of the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: Oh! You can back out as you will.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am not backing out, but the hon. gentleman cannot expect to have it all as he likes. I'll read another extract. "Mr. Huntington said that the charter was obtained in the session of 1872, long after the men who furnished the money to him (Sir Hugh Allan) were repudiated and made arrangements with him (Hon. Mr. Huntington) to bring the charges against the Government." (*Cheers.*)

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON rose to a question of order. The report of my speech is entirely without foundation. (*Cries of order, order.*) That is a question of fact, and the hon. gentlemen can correct it afterwards.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I heard it myself. (*Cries from Government benches, "We all heard it."*) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will deny that he said Jay Cooke would have him in his office without a witness.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: That is another falsehood of the *Ottawa Times*. That paper, which is inspired by hon. gentlemen opposite, deliberately falsified my speech from the beginning to the end. I refused to disgrace myself by noticing the malignant statement of the dastard sheet.

What I said was that I had not seen Jay Cooke for four years; that I went to a prominent promoter of the Northern Pacific Railway (*hear, hear*), with that view of conversing with him and found that they were the allies of hon. gentlemen opposite, because they would not even talk to me without people being present. (*Hear, hear.*)

The SPEAKER: I must call the hon. member to order. I hope this interruption will cease. The hon. member knows what the rules of debate are as well as any one else in the House, and this plan of interruption can only lead to assembly confusion in the House. The hon. gentleman will ask his opportunity from the House. I am sure it will be given to him, and he can then make his denial on the question of fact.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I wish to invite the attention of every hon. member of this House who is an honest and candid man, to the statement I am making. There could be no amalgamation before the elections. In my telegram of the 26th of July I stated that the question must stand over until after the elections; that the two companies would stand on perfectly equal footing, and that the arrangements which had been made between Mr. Macpherson and Mr. Abbott should be the guiding line. That arrangement was that Upper Canada should have seven, Lower Canada six, and each of the other Provinces one Director on the Board. Not by any chance or possibility could Sir Hugh Allan by his large capital, or the influence created by that capital, get an undue influence on the Board for Lower Canada or for himself over my own Province.

On the 30th of July I received a letter from Sir Hugh Allan, Sir George-É. Cartier being sick, stating that he had made certain arrangements with Sir George, and it was a bad arrangement, for it was something like this, that if there should not be an amalgamation he thought that Sir Hugh Allan's Company ought to get the charter. I received that message in the middle of my election contest, and I said to myself it is not much consequence whether one company or the other gets the charter if they unite, but it will kill me, it will kill us if the Montreal Company without amalgamation receives it. However, I telegraphed back at once that I would not agree to the arrangement, and I would go down to Montreal that night. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of a severe election contest, for I was elected only by 130, whereas at the previous election I had a majority of 300, I said I would run down to Montreal on this matter. I telegraphed to Sir George-É. Cartier that I would not consent to the arrangement, and that my telegram of the 26th of July, 1872, would be the decision of the Government, and the Government would be bound thereby, and would be governed by nothing else.

I wish it to be clearly understood, beyond the possibility of doubt, that the Canadian Government had agreed that since it could not obtain an amalgamation of the two companies before the elections, they would try to get an amalgamation after the elections, and in such an amalgamation they would do what was fair, in order to get Sir Hugh Allan made President of the Amalgamated Company. (*Cheers.*)

I say that that arrangement made by Sir George-É. Cartier was set aside and why? Because it would have killed me in Upper Canada. I telegraphed that even at the risk of my election I would go down to Montreal and put an end to it, and Sir George-É. Cartier, when he got my message, saw what an absurd proposition it was, and there was an end of it, and Sir Hugh Allan telegraphed back that the bargain was ended. At that time there had not been one single word said about money subscriptions.

Sir, it may be very wrong to give subscriptions to election funds at all, but is there any one gentleman opposite who will say that he had not expended money himself, or has been aided in doing so by his friends. (*Several members of the Opposition here denied the charge.*) Whether those acts had been done by members themselves or their friends, money was spent and always would be spent on elections. I don't hesitate to say—and I state this in the face of this House, of the country and of the world—that I am not aware of any one single farthing having been spent illegitimately and contrary to the law—(*Opposition laughter and cheers*)—by members on the Government side of the House. I can tell of one man on the other side who spent \$26,000; another case I can prove of spending \$30,000, and I can also prove cases of spending \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000 and \$8,000, and when the Committee which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) challenged me to move, and which I intend to move, is appointed, I shall give the proofs. (*Laughter, in which Mr. Blain joined.*) I can prove the expenditure of money by that gentleman (Mr. Blain) himself.

Mr. BLAIN: If the right hon. gentleman refers to me, I say there is not a particle of truth in the statement. Not one single solitary cent came out of my pocket unfairly. (*Cheers and laughter.*)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: Perhaps the gentleman has not a pocket. Perhaps his wife has. (*Laughter, and cries of "Shame" from the Opposition.*)

Mr. BLAIN rose. (*Cries of "Order".*) He said the right hon. gentleman had made a charge against him. He would answer it at another time.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: Before the Committee which I propose to move, and which will have power to administer an oath, and which the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has invited, I shall be able to prove the fact I stated. The hon. gentleman will perhaps reserve himself for that. (*Interruption.*)

Hon. Mr. HOLTON: I raise the question of order. I doubt whether the right hon. gentleman is in order in making statements affecting the right of hon. gentlemen to sit in this House without formulating charges to be followed by a motion. The hon. gentleman intimates his intention of making a motion at a future time, but he cannot move a motion of the kind indicated in a debate on the Address. To charge members with having obtained their seats by improper means is therefore a violation of the proprieties of debate, and I believe of other standing orders of the House.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE: In the case of the member for York West (Mr. Blain) the proceeding is doubly irregular, for it is interfering with an actual petition pending before an election Committee.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House really does not properly relate to these subjects. (*Hear, hear.*) I have not hitherto interfered in any way with this debate. There has been a good deal of language used which is not strictly Parliamentary, and reference made that might better have been avoided, but the subject of the debate is of such a character that I thought I ought not to interfere with free discussion. I have not used any influence to stay the parties who have been marking this charge against the Ministry, and I should have still pursued the same course unless applied to by the other side; but I must say I think it would be better if the Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) would refrain from making direct charges against individual members. (*Hear, hear.*)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I submit to your decision, Sir, I would not have alluded to the hon. member if it had not been for the offensive way in which he interrupted me, and my knowledge about his case. The hon. gentlemen opposite will find out that I know a great deal more about their elections than they would care that I should know.

I shall now proceed with the history I am giving to the House as well as I can under these unseemly interruptions. Sir, there never was an occasion, there never was a minute, in which the interests of Canada were sacrificed by the Government of Canada for election purposes. (*Loud cheers.*) I say that we carry out the law as well as

the law could possibly be carried out. (*Cheers.*) I say that up to the very last moment we tried to obtain an amalgamation of the two Companies. I almost went on my knees, which is not my habit, I am sorry to say, to my friends in Toronto, for the purpose of securing an amalgamation, and though I did not secure an amalgamation of the two Companies, yet I got an amalgamation of the two interests, and secured the best men in Western Canada.

I have no hesitation in saying that in the Company chartered by the Government, we have the very best men in Canada, considering all the circumstances. Let us go over the whole Board from Upper Canada. There is Mr. Donald McInnes, of Hamilton, I will ask the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Thomson) if he is not a merchant of standing and respectability, and one of the last men to sell the interests of the Dominion to the Yankees. I asked the Hon. Mr. Carling to come on the Board, but when the House came to the conclusion to exclude members of Parliament from that Board, I obtained Major Walker, representing one of the leading industries in the West. Then there is Col. Cumberland, and can we suppose that Col. Cumberland, who is at the heat of the great railway interests, and is charged with the management of millions of dollars, would sell himself to Sir Hugh Allan or the Yankees. (*Cheers.*)

I ask if Mr. Fleming, the engineer, the man whose name will live on the continent for his great engineering exploits, and who was objected to with Col. Cumberland and Major Walker by Sir Hugh Allan. Then the last man I asked was Mr. Walter Shanly. To some of you Walter Shanly may be unknown, but in the old Provinces of Canada he is everywhere known as being most highly respected, and as an engineer, the man who formerly managed the Grand Trunk, the man who achieved the great triumph of constructing the Hoosac Tunnel. I asked him as a personal friend of mine, as an old Ontarian, as one who was representing a wealthy constituency, to come on that board, and much against his will he came.

In the same way let us look at the Lower Province members. We look at Mr. E.R. Burpee. That is a truly honoured name, I am told, in New Brunswick. Do you think that E.R. Burpee is going to sell to the Yankees, Jay Cooke & Co., or to the member for Shefford. (*Laughter and cheers.*) Then we come to Lieutenant-Governor Archibald, of Nova Scotia, and is he likely to sell us to the Yankees, the member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington), or Jay Cooke & Co. I appeal to all the members for British Columbia, some of whom were opposed to him in politics, whether the name of Dr. Helmcken did not inspire respect. (*Cheers.*) With respect to Manitoba, I will only ask you to say whether Mr. McDermott, the richest and oldest merchant in Manitoba, a man who was the last who would sell the interest of this great Dominion to the Yankees, whether that man would sell Canada. If ever any Government succeeded in accomplishing any particular object, surely this Government tried, and succeeded, to prevent foreigners from obtaining influence in or control over our transcontinental railway. (*Cheers.*)

By their line of action, the gentlemen opposite have postponed for some years the building of that railway, and they have

besmirched unjustly, dishonourably, the character of the Canadian Government and of the Canadian people. (*Cheers.*) If there be any delay, any postponement in the completion of that great system of railways, I charge it to the hon. gentlemen opposite. (*Cheers.*) Long after this quarrel is over, it will be recorded in the history of this Dominion of Canada that there was one body of men in this country willing to forget self, to forget Party, to forget section to build up a great interest and make a great country, and they will say that there was another Party who fought section against section, province against province, who were unable to rise to the true position of affairs, and I say the history of the future will be our justification and their condemnation. (*Loud cheers.*)

But, Sir, I have some more to say. I say this Government has been treated with foul wrongs. (*Cheers.*) I say this Government has been treated as no Government has ever been treated before. It has been met with an Opposition the like of which no Government in any civilized country was ever met. (*Loud cheers.*) I say we have been opposed not with fair weapons, not by fair argument, not by fair discussion, as a Government ought to be opposed, but opposed in a manner which will throw shame on hon. gentlemen opposite. (*Renewed cheers.*)

When we first met in this House, and we first discussed the Pacific Railway measures, I told you, Sir, that there was a confirmed plan to kill the Pacific Railway Company. The attack on the Government was a secondary matter. It was comparatively an inferior matter. But those gentlemen opposite went into the attack for the purpose of getting in evidence as quickly as possible for the purpose of sending it across the Atlantic by cable and kill Sir Hugh Allan's enterprise, and afterwards leave the proof of the evidence to chance.

Then we found that Sir Hugh Allan, by a very natural feeling, agreed to pay a certain sum of money to Mr. McMullen for the return of his correspondence, which was accepted, and the whole matter was arranged. Then blackmail was attempted to be levied on me, but I was not subject to be blackmailed. (*Laughter.*) They did levy blackmail on Sir Hugh Allan in Montreal and McMullen, for surrendering his letters to Sir Hugh, was paid \$20,000, and promised \$17,000 more on certain conditions being fulfilled. Mr. McMullen got his extra sum from some one.

The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Huntington) would deny that Mr. McMullen was paid by some one. Everyone will believe that man who was to be paid that large sum of \$17,000 did not accept it because he was offered some larger sums. (*Cheers.*) I believe that when we have the Committee which the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) challenged to move for, I shall be able to prove more than the \$17,000, and I believe I shall be able to prove there were other parties in the purchase of G.W. McMullen, who over-bid Sir Hugh Allan. (*Cheers and an Opposition member, "is it not right?"*) It was never right to buy him in the first place, nor in the second place, but if Sir Hugh Allan by paying \$17,000 committed a crime, the man who paid him a larger sum must surely have committed a larger crime. (*Laughter and cheers.*)

I say that you must have a Committee in order to ascertain who are the gentlemen who went and deliberately bought those documents from Sir Hugh Allan. That may be fair war, but some one said it was striking below the belt. The man who goes deliberately and bribes people to hand a man's private letters, is a man who will be marked as a criminal all his life, and the man who goes and deliberately purchases private letters for any purpose, even though it may do good to the public, and expose a corrupt Government, will be generally condemned. Then we come down to a little more infamy. When I tell you that a letter of mine, addressed to a colleague at Montreal, was deliberately stolen, and when I tell you there was no doubt that it was stolen because it was thought to contain something that could be made politically useful, you can understand what infamy that is.

Mr. BLAIN rose to a point of order, and submitted that this question was not before the House.

The SPEAKER ruled against him stating that it came on the Address, which covers almost every possible question connected with public affairs.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: When I wrote that letter to my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, I sent, at the same time, three telegrams to three different places, and that telegram was seen by some one acting in the interests of the Opposition, and from it they supposed that the letter would be connected with the Pacific Railway matter. That letter was deliberately stolen, not only stolen, but was stolen by an officer of the Post Office Department. I say stolen by an officer who was bought by some one, and who will some day, not long distant, for the evidence is being followed up and has not been abandoned, be found out, and it will be shown that he, believing that the letter contained something that would criminate the Government, stole it from the office and handed it over to be used in the manner the House was aware of. True it was that the letter contained nothing respecting the Pacific Railway.

I have got evidence beyond the possibility of a doubt, that my telegrams were stolen from Sir Hugh Allan's office, day after day; that a man went to the office night after night, after six o'clock and copied those telegrams and brought them down and sold them to the Opposition; that the safe of the office was not broken, and that after the documents were copied and sworn to by the man, he was paid money for them. I state this in presence of the House and of the country; and there was such a dishonest system of espionage carried on. And I say more than this, I join with the hon. member for Bothwell in asking for the Committee, before which I will prove all that I have said, and will put a credible witness in the box, who will swear he saw it with his own eyes.

You can judge how poorly the Government has been treated. In fact no Government in the world could exist if every drawer is to be searched, if every confidential servant is to be bribed by money offered to them. I may tell you this one thing, that I had got the evidence of this treachery, parties actually approached a secretary in Mr. Abbot's office, and offered him money to tell how much

evidence had been obtained. Mr. Abbott is present in the House and will attest the truth of what I state. I can prove that from the beginning to the end of this business there was never a more gross system of espionage, of corruption, of bribing men to steal papers from their employers; and I would ask how any Opposition or Party in this country could stand under such an accusation if it be proved.

Sir, before I sit down I will touch upon one point to which I have not yet adverted, and that is how far a Government or member of a Government may concern themselves in elections, and the necessary expenditure or supposed expenditure of money at elections. I would wish to point out what has taken place in England, not under the old regime, but by the Reform Party in England. It is of some importance, as showing at all events that for everything I have got good authority. The House well remembers the great struggle, almost amounting to a revolution, which accompanied the passage of the Reform Bill in England. Well, Mr. Speaker, strange to say, the Reform Party there, who were going to purify the political atmosphere, those who were going to put down the old borough mongers, did not hesitate to spend money at elections. They did not trust to the excellence of their measures, to the justness of their cause, and the consequence was that before the date of the Carlton Club and the Reform Club, of which so much has recently been said, the Reform Party had a Treasurer, and whom do you think they gave the office to? It was the maker and unmaker of Whiggery, Edward Ellice.

Now, Edward Ellice was the man who made the Whig Government. He was a member of the Government, and acted as whipper-in of the Party, and was the man ordinarily employed in making arrangements about elections. But Edward Ellice was man incapable of doing anything which he did not think he was justified in doing. Any man who knew that right hon. gentlemen, who knew what a great influence he had on the history of his country, would know that Edward Ellice was perhaps a greater man for pulling the strings and making arrangements for Reform than even Lord John Russell himself.

Let me tell you a little story about him. In my boyhood, when I knew him, he often told me stories of this sort. In 1834 there happened to be a committee on the Inns of Court. Mr. Daniel O'Connell was the Chairman, and it came out in that investigation, which involved the seat of a member of Parliament, that Lord Westham had got five hundred pounds from Mr. Ellice the Secretary of the Treasury, in order to carry the Liberal candidate. O'Connell felt it his bounden duty to report this matter to the House, and there was a motion of censure moved against Mr. Ellice by Mr. O'Connell. Mr. Ellice resigned his place and I shall read you what he said. At the time he made that speech he was Secretary of War; at the time he expended the money he was Secretary of the Treasury. He was an important man to the Government and might have been Cabinet Minister, had it not been that as every one who knew the history of those times knew, he would not take that position. He was the man who arranged matters for the Whigs, and he was charged with having used the secret service money in elections, as, by the way, I was a short time ago.

The right hon. gentlemen then quoted from Mr. Ellice's speech, volume 27, *Mirror of Parliament*, and now said he, I will quote from Sir Charles Buller. Sir Charles Buller was the head and front of the Philosophical Radicals of England. They formed a Party of their own, and tried to engraft their principles on the politics of England, and, although they did not succeed, they sowed good seed, the results of which are seen at present day. I, who was a boy, remember him, and remember the kindness with which he discussed politics with me, and I am certain that he would have sustained the cause of the Liberal Party by nothing that was wrong.

The right hon. gentleman quoted from the speech referred to. The attack was made upon Mr. Ellice that he had spent money out of the Secret Service Fund; but when Mr. Ellice rose and said that he had spent no money out of the Secret Service Fund, and that although a very large sum of money had passed through his hands for election purposes, none of it had been improperly procured, the House passed on without taking any action, though Mr. O'Connell supported the motion with all his great eloquence and ability.

A remark has been made in the newspapers that on one occasion I stated that no money had been expended by the Government on elections, and in answer to the charge, I asked Mr. Kidd, on the hustings at South Perth, whether any money had been expended at his election, and he said no, no statement could have been truer.

Sir, the money that was expended by the Committee, of which I was a member, was not with the purpose or object of endangering any man's seat. (*Ironical cheers from the Opposition, and cheers from the Ministerial benches.*) I state distinctly, so far as I know, not one single farthing that passed through my hands was expended improperly or contrary to the law. If it is so, the election tribunal of the country will settle that question, and, as I understand it, no improper expenditure has been proved in any election tribunal. (*Cheers.*) I say distinctly, say it in my place as a member of Parliament, that money was distributed for the purpose of fighting money against money, fire against fire, influence against influence; and we were over-matched by the hon. gentlemen opposite. (*Loud cheers.*)

There is one more remark that I have to make before I sit down. The Government never gave Sir Hugh Allan any contract that I am aware of. (*Cheers.*) We never gave him any contract in which he had a controlling influence. We had formed a Committee of thirteen men, chosen carefully and painfully, for the purpose of controlling Sir Hugh Allan from having any undue influence. We promised, we provided, that not one of the board should hold more than one hundred thousand dollars of the stock, that not one single man should have any interest in the contract whatever, which were, of course, only the ordinary provisions in a charter of incorporation. (*Cheers.*)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have only one more thing to say on this point. I put it to your own minds. There were thirteen gentlemen, Sir Hugh Allan and others incorporated by that charter. That charter—study it, take it home with you. Is there any single power,

privilege or advantage given to Sir Hugh Allan with that contract that has not been given equally to the other twelve? (*Cheers.*) It is not pretended that any of the other twelve paid money for their positions. It is not contended that the gentlemen gave anything further than their own personal feelings might dictate. (*Cheers.*) You cannot name a man of these thirteen that has got any advantage over the other except that Sir Hugh Allan has his name down first on this paper. (*Cheers.*)

Can any one believe that the Government is guilty of the charges made against them. I call upon any one who does to read that charter. Is there anything in that contract? If there is a word in that charter which derogates from the rights of Canada; if there is any undue privilege, or right, or preponderance given to any one of these thirteen Directors, I say, Mr. Speaker, I am condemned. But, Sir, I commit myself, the Government commits itself, to the hands of this House, and far beyond the House, it commits itself to the country at large. (*Loud cheers.*) We have faithfully done our duty. We have fought the battle of Confederation. We have fought the battle of Union. We have had Party strife setting province against province, and more than all, we have had in the greatest province the preponderating province of the Dominion, every prejudice and sectional feeling that could be arrayed against us.

I have been the victim of that conduct to a great extent; but I have fought the battle of Confederation, the battle of Union, the battle of the Dominion of Canada. I throw myself upon this House; I throw myself upon this country; I throw myself upon posterity, and I believe that I know that, notwithstanding the many failings in my life, I shall have the voice of this county and this House rallying round me. (*Cheers.*) And, Sir, if I am mistaken in that, I can confidently appeal to a higher Court, to the Court of my own conscience, and to the Court of Posterity. (*Cheers.*)

I leave it with this House with every confidence. I am equal to either fortune. I can see cast the decision of this House either for or against me, but whether it be against me or for me I know, and it is no vain boast to say so, for even my enemies will admit that I am no boaster, that there does not exist in Canada a man who has given more of his time, more of his heart, more of his wealth, or more of his intellect and power, such as it may be, for the good of this Dominion of Canada. (*The right hon. gentleman resumed his seat amid loud and long continued cheering.*)

Hon. Mr. BLAKE rose amid loud cheers from the Opposition, and said the hon. gentleman who has addressed the House for more than five hours, has in a long Parliamentary experience learned how to conduct a weak case as no man better than himself knows. When the logic of the case is with him, when he has got an honest straight case, no man knows better than himself the importance of marshalling all the facts in their order, of abandoning all irrelevant topics, of putting all else aside, and of confiding to the House the question which is for its decision; and no man is better aware than himself that when the case is different, as this case is, when the case is of such a character that it cannot bear investigation, that the only course open is to reverse that mode of procedure, to confuse the argument, touch a tender part now for a moment, and then pass

away from it, and revert to it again, but with no connected stain, with no attempt at plain argument, to demonstrate that which it is impossible to demonstrate (*cheers*), and that other artifice which at the close of a long career he has brought into prominence tonight, and which he has copied from his early professional experience, he has followed in this debate, namely, when he has no case to abuse the other side. (*Cheers.*)

Sir, the interests which are at stake on this occasion are too momentous, the circumstances we have to consider are of too grave a character, to permit us for one moment to waste the time of this House by any discussion which is not fairly relevant to these matters, and which is not for the determination of this House. (*Hear, hear.*)

As to the apostrophe by the hon. gentleman, as to those influences upon which he said he now throws himself for judgment, upon the feeling and intelligent judgement, of the House and country, and of posterity, and last and highest, on that member's *conscientia recta* which he says he possesses, my short answer to that feeling apostrophe is this: that the hon. gentleman was called upon to vindicate before the people his policy. When he was called upon by reason and argument to sustain his course, and to prove his title to the confidence of his country, it was not to these high and elevating sentiments he appealed; it was not upon the intelligent judgment of the people he relied, but it was upon Sir Hugh Allan's money (*loud cheers*), which he obtained by the sale of the rights of the Canadian people, which he held in trust.

What have we to do in this great discussion with the question whether a letter had been stolen, whether a telegram had been bought, whether McMullen sold or gave the letters of Sir Hugh Allan? Have these questions anything to do with the question whether the hon. gentleman acted unworthily of his position, and betrayed the trust confided to him? These suggestions of his are interpolated into this debate most unjustly, and they are excusable only from the feeble condition in which the hon. gentleman this night stands. (*Cheers.*) But for that feeble condition, unscrupulous as he has shown himself in debate, I believe that even he would have abstained from resorting to these arguments. If the hon. gentleman has any charge to make against any member of the House of having been guilty of acts unworthy of a member of this House, I do not doubt that at the proper time he will formulate that charge. I do not doubt that even-handed justice will be meted out as soon as he shall have established that they have acted in a manner unworthy of a member of this House; but what have we to do tonight with the question whether the hon. gentleman can or cannot formulate such charges, or can or cannot establish them?

We are dealing with men whom we impeach not as accused but as established criminals. (*Cheers.*) This pledge of the prisoner at the bar, that his accuser has been guilty of some other crime, which the hon. gentleman has been this night declaring, cannot now be entertained. Let him, or those who succeed him in Parliament, at some future day, as soon as he pleases when these charges have been disposed of, redeem his pledges this night given, and put these

matters, or such of them as may be deemed proper, to trial, but let us disembarass the controversy of them.

Whatever be the fate of these charges, they cannot affect the fate of one vote to be given on this question. They cannot affect the consideration of that question which my hon. friend from Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) has tendered for the judgment of this House, and which it is proposed to supersede by the amendment of the hon. member for Pictou (Hon. Mr. McDonald). That question is, comparatively speaking, a short and simple one. I thought till I heard the hon. gentleman's speech that it was large enough—that it embraced topics which might well be the subject matter of a considerable amount of discussion; but it is short, simple, and contracted within narrow limits, when you pare it of the vast range of irrelevant topics, which the hon. gentleman has chosen to bring into the discussion.

What are the two questions? First, whether, in the course of the investigation, the conduct of the Government merits the approval of the House; and, secondly, whether the result of the evidence is such as to merit the approval or condemnation of the House. What have we to do with the cries which the hon. gentleman says we raised against him? What have we to do with the question of the Nova Scotia subsidy? What have we to do with the question of the Washington Treaty? What have we to do with the question of the Manitoba Act, or with the attitude of the Opposition at the period of the union of British Columbia, or upon the subject of the Pacific Railway?

The hon. gentleman commenced his speech with the deliberate design of confusing matters, of taking up a subject and then dropping it, and once more approaching it. He commenced by an allusion to the question of the prorogation, and he argued the question upon two grounds. He, first of all, pointed out that prorogation and the will of the people could no longer be opposed, and that the prerogative was a part of the liberty of the people, and he insisted that the question could not subsist for a moment. Whatever opinion he holds as to what the duty of His Excellency was under the advice tendered to him, that question is not raised in this debate.

I limit myself to what is raised in the debate, and that is the course of His Excellency's Ministers—(*cheers*)—the advice they tendered and the course they pursued. It is all very well to tell us that the prerogative is of less importance than it once was. It is all very well to tell us it can no longer accomplish in the hands of the Crown what once it could accomplish.

It makes no difference to a free people whether their rights be invaded by the Crown or the Cabinet. What is material to them is to know that their rights are not invaded, and to secure that they shall not be invaded, to guard against that increased and increasing power of the Executive which presents itself in these modern days. This is no fantasy of mine. You will find the best writers upon constitutional topics pointing out that danger. You will find that most fair and impartial and candid writer, Hallam, expressly

adverting to the danger of the increase by insidious degrees of the executive power of the Cabinet, and the importance on the part of the people to prevent that increase.

It is very well to tell the people you are all powerful, but if you hand over to the Cabinet powers—inordinate powers, not susceptible of being kept under proper control—that very expression of popular will which is necessary in order to popular Government you may be deprived of and what we complain of in the present case is that the hon. gentleman says the prerogative under the advice of responsible Ministers can never be used against the people.

We allege that the prerogative under the advice of the Ministers has been used against the rights of the people. (*Cheers.*) We allege that it has been used in order to prevent the action of the people's representatives. We allege that it has been used in order to withdraw from the cognizance of those representatives the great case which had been pending between the Government and their accusers. We allege in this very case you find an instance of the evil which the hon. gentleman ridicules as a fantasy of the imagination, and you find the necessity of preserving all the forms and the substances of the Constitution, and for preserving all the security for free Government and every reference to the popular body, which our ancestors have handed down to us.

Now, the most dangerous doctrine Parliament can listen to with assent, is the doctrine that it can part with some portion of its ancient privileges. We ought to be most jealous with reference to each one of these. We ought to find not merely that there does not exist some present particular danger from the abandonment, but also, that there exists no possibility of danger from their abandonment. And even if we cannot see at the moment the danger, we must find some preponderating cause for abandoning them before we give up one safeguard which has been handed down to us, and which it is our duty to transmit unimpaired to posterity. (*Cheers.*)

The hon. gentleman has argued this question historically; he has told us that a formal announcement of prorogation was made as from the Crown. I did not understand any such announcement (*Hear.*) No such announcement was in words made. (*Hear, hear.*) I have heard the hon. gentleman announce the intentions of the Crown before today upon such topics. I have heard him announce what the advice to the Crown would be, and what he had been authorized by the Crown to state upon such topics.

That on this occasion it will be said by him there was a formal announcement from the Crown, I say the House did not so understand it. I say more; it is contradicted by the facts supposed, that if the Crown had formally, through the First Minister (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) anterior to adjournment, communicated the intention to prorogue at the opening of the House on the 13th of August, the Crown would have sent a second communication to this Chamber, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the same effect; and yet we were informed by you on the 13th of August that you had that day

received a communication from His Excellency that it was his intention to prorogue the House that day. I want to know, if a formal message had been understood by the Government to be communicated before, why there was a second intimation to the House through you to that effect?

No, Sir, the whole idea of prorogation on the 13th of August was based of necessity upon the one theory of the result of the members of the Committee, namely, that their labours would be effectually prosecuted, and that they would result in a verdict of acquittal. I do not believe that the hon. gentleman would seriously argue that he intended that this House, provided the evidence before the Committee established the charges, was to wait till next spring before it pronounced judgment upon the case; that this House would allow Ministers to maintain the control of the Government of this country after they had been clearly proved to have been unworthy of the trust committed to them. I believe that a proposal like that would not have been assented to by the House, and whatever was said, must from the necessity of the case be taken to have been said under the conditions I have named.

He himself would not have dared to say to this House "though the evidence taken before the Committee proves my guilt, I will still have Parliament not meet for business on the 13th; I will still retain power till February or March next." He would not have dared to say that; but in the ostentatious assumption of innocence that he put forward, he chose to affirm that nothing whatever could be proved, and that the result of the Committee would be to establish his innocence, and therefore there would be nothing for the House to do.

Now, Sir, that it was thought impossible that that state of things which the hon. gentleman was finally and definitely agreed upon, the adjournment should, under all circumstances, and under all contingencies, remain as the settled state of things, is shown by our being here this night, discussing this question, because the contingency did arise, which rendered it quite impossible to adhere to this programme of the hon. gentleman, which he declared to be settled and final. His programme was that Parliament should not meet till February.

What do we hear now of a breach of faith on the part of the Crown? The idea was that we were not to meet till next spring. There was no idea of a fall sitting, and is it not just as much a breach of faith for every member to have been summoned here on the 23rd of October, as it would have been to have been summoned for business on the 13th of August? We are here at a time when it was not expected, according to the programme, so the hon. gentleman's fixtures were all conceived on this one contingency, and that contingency not having happened, the Committee not having been able to do anything, we are here today, which, according to the hon. gentleman's view, is a breach of faith.

It seems to me that under these circumstances we have to consider this prorogation not by itself alone, but as a means to an end. (*Hear, hear.*) It did obviously accomplish one thing. On the 21st of July, the authorized announcement was made to members

that at the earliest moment this matter would be submitted to a tribunal competent to take evidence under oath. It also appears that while the Committee was in existence, and its existence was contemporaneous with the existence of that session of Parliament. Ministers themselves thought it not fit to interfere with the Committee, although it could do nothing by issuing a Commission the Commission being, as we may fairly assume, the tribunal which was in contemplation by them upon the 21st July, when the authorized announcement was made. You find so far back as this the design to withdraw from Parliament, and to bring before another tribunal this investigation. Now, it was perfectly obvious that the effect of prorogation would be to destroy the enquiry, to destroy the powers of the Committee, and that whatever had to be done would have to be recommenced. Under our Constitution, owing to a difference in its forms, similar results would not be arrived at in England, as has been frequently said on both sides. This charge was in substance an impeachment.

At this stage of the hon. gentleman's speech,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON suggested the adjournment it being half past two o'clock.

The House accordingly adjourned.