

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 4, 1873

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 p.m.

Prayers

Mr. KIRKPATRICK presented the report of the Quebec Centre Committee, which had decided that the Hon. Mr. Cauchon was duly elected.

* * *

THE ADDRESS

Hon. Mr. BLAKE resumed the debate on the Address. He said that last night he pointed out that a great number of the topics introduced by the First Minister of the Crown were wholly irrelevant to the serious question engaging our attention. The House and the hon. gentleman know it is not my custom to shrink from a fair discussion of any public question at any time, or at any place, or before audiences from any of the Provinces whom the hon. gentleman seeks to array against me, and whose champion the hon. gentleman assumed to be last night. I am perfectly prepared to vindicate, and I believe satisfactorily to establish, the motives by which I was actuated in consenting to the policy which my friends have pursued on public questions to which he had referred.

But, Sir, it is not fit that we should interfere with this discussion by these considerations, and I feel myself at a loss in the discussion of the electoral campaign, because it is known I was not present at the campaign. I was surprised to learn the course the campaign took, according to the view of the hon. gentleman opposite. All I can say is that from the information I received, I am led to believe the First Minister's recollection is inaccurate as to the points agitated in the west, and I believe if anything was said in Nova Scotia, that it was an attack upon my hon. friend for giving that Province too much for her Provincial Building.

Now, the conduct of the Government in the past has no more to do with protecting them against this charge than their misdeeds, if they have been guilty of any, should have an ill effect. In establishing the charges against them, it is to be remembered that the charge is one of breach of high public trust. You must not forget that charges of this description can only be maintained against persons who have borne very good characters. It is against persons obtaining positions of trust, who having, as they allege, assuming their arguments to be correct, obtained through their policy a position which they might use improperly, they put forward their

previous good conduct in defence of their improprieties. The embezzlement by a confidential clerk, or the betrayal of a trust by a bribe, could not be condoned by previous good conduct. At criminal trials witnesses are called to test the good character of the criminal, but they are merely called to mitigate the sentence; but upon this question the verdict of this House is asked, guilty or not guilty of the charges, and of conduct which merits the severe censure of this House. Upon that issue good conduct was immaterial. It was material in one sense, because it involved a confession of guilt by appealing to these mitigating circumstances.

So far from the Opposition being actuated by any sectional feeling, as has been alleged against us in regard to our policy respecting the different Provinces, I believe it can be demonstrated that fair play on our part of this Dominion has been the groundwork of our policy in the past and will be the groundwork of our policy in the future. He is the true sectionalist who seeks to array Province against Province. Let it not be said that in this House any member, come from what Province he may, is not to be free to argue questions of public policy.

Now I return to those matters which are more or less touched by the matter before the House. In the first place, the hon. gentleman argued that the motion of the member for Shefford, was a motion of want of confidence. He did not think that was very material, but the proofs in this matter were threefold; first of all the hon. gentleman read a statement from the Ottawa correspondence of *The Globe*, and he announced that the great party, which my hon. friend leads, was irrevocably bound, because *The Globe* correspondent said, before it was known what the motion would be, that it was expected it would be a motion of want of confidence. That argument is so absurd that the mere statement of it is its sufficient answer.

Then the hon. gentleman turned to the member for Wentworth South (Mr. Rymal). My hon. friend did say his opinion was that the motion was intended as a motion of want of confidence. I did not so understand it, and I do not understand that my hon. friend set up his views as binding upon the whole party. Lastly, the hon. gentleman said the mode of making the motion indicated it to be a motion of want of confidence, namely, by amendment to a motion to go into Committee of Supply. That is not correct in point of Parliamentary law, and there are to be found two notable instances of the same, contradicting the hon. gentleman's theory, in which amendments to go into Committee of Supply were carried, and were not treated as motion of want of confidence.

Well, Sir, what were the reasons on the other hand? The nature of the motion itself is one which prevented it from being called properly a motion of want of confidence. A motion for enquiry is

not of necessity a motion of want of confidence. A charge is made; a charge of such gravity as to demand an investigation, and the proposal to have an investigation cannot be a proposal that there is no confidence in the Administration. I quite admit that the Administration can make it a motion of want of confidence, but the motion itself, as projected by the mover, cannot be considered one of want of confidence.

Then the attitude of the member for Shefford in making the motion, indicated it was not one of want of confidence. He made no speech; he made no attack upon the Ministry; he simply made his statement and the charge based upon it. Then the attitude of Ministers themselves stamps their argument out, because they themselves made a similar motion a few days later.

Next the hon. gentleman alleged that no pressure was put upon him to grant the Committee. Well, of course we accept unreservedly the statement of the hon. gentleman, but it is established by the evidence brought forward last night in this House, that several supporters of the Government considered the charges were a proper subject of investigation, and they informed the members of the Government that was the last vote they would receive from them unless the Committee was granted. By what intuition the hon. gentleman became possessed of this fact it boasts not to consider; suffice it to say that pressure was put upon the Government, and that the Government yielded to the pressure.

Then the hon. gentleman stated that he never dreamed that the Committee would proceed at once. I ask every candid man in this House, except the hon. gentleman, whether he ever dreamed of anything else, whether the whole tone of the discussion, the conduct of the various proceedings which ensued subsequent to the appointment of the Committee, did not all point conclusively to the commencing at once, and prolonging the labours of the Committee beyond the session only in case it should be found impossible to finish those labours during the session?

The hon. gentleman was bound, if he thought that this Committee would not meet to do business till after the return of these gentlemen, to have said at once that the Committee could do nothing until their return. He was bound to have taken the House into his confidence in this matter, but there were many matters with reference to which the hon. gentleman kept his supporters in the dark. All that time he had in his desk these damning papers—that contract between Sir Hugh Allan and his American associates—papers which have disgraced the writer of them irredeemably throughout the world. And yet the hon. gentleman never took his supporters into his confidence in this matter, and I venture to say it was a surprise and a shock to many of them when they found that before this charter was granted, while nothing had been done that could not be undone, the hon. gentleman had become acquainted with the villainy that had been perpetrated by the man whom he afterwards placed in the position of President of the Company. (*Loud cheers.*)

It was the duty of the hon. gentleman to have told the House, which he was swaying with an iron rod, whither he was leading

them, and that this Committee could not meet till these gentlemen returned. But I shall prove by facts beyond dispute that, whatever the hon. gentleman's secret intention was, his public and avowed plan of action was that the Committee should proceed. The hon. gentleman has told us that he knew the chances were infinitesimally small that these gentlemen would return during the session, and yet the hon. gentleman agreed to have the Oaths Bill pushed through the House, and he brought down His Excellency in the middle of the session to assent to that Bill. To what end did he do that unusual thing, if the Oaths Bill was not to be used immediately afterwards? (*Hear, hear.*) It is clear that, whatever may have been the hon. gentleman's secret thoughts, he was willing to lead this House to believe that immediate action on the part of the Committee was desired and intended by him. (*Hear, hear.*)

But when the Committee met, the hon. gentleman applied for an adjournment, which the Committee agreed to. That proposition was subjected to the House, and then for the first time he delivered a speech in vindication of his conduct in which he declared there was not one jot or tittle of proof of these charges. He made a speech, in which I am sure he led every man on both sides of this House to believe that either he must have been clearly and utterly false, or my hon. friend for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) must have been utterly mistaken in bringing forward this charge. No shadow of foundation for it; nothing whatever which could have led to the preferring of such charges. These were the declarations of innocence on the part of the hon. gentleman.

Under these circumstances, and by virtue of that denial (how candid it was, he having all the papers in his desk at the time, you may judge), he induced the House to postpone the Committee. The Committee was to meet on the 2nd of July. It so happened that I was not in the House during any of the discussions upon the subject of the Oaths Bill. I was present when the Committee was moved for, when the hon. gentleman made the statement that the evidence should be taken under oath, for he it was who first made the suggestion to take the evidence on oath. I thought it strange that he should ask that Committee to sit after prorogation without asking for a Bill to authorize that procedure, and I thought also that if he desired to take evidence on that, he should introduce a Bill for that purpose.

I have argued this question before, and I argue it to-day upon other and higher grounds than the question whether the Oaths Bill was *intra* or *extra vires*. That is of no consequence, because if we have not yet the power we can easily get that power, but the question of disallowance is one of the most serious questions that can be brought before this Parliament. The views of the First Minister upon this question of disallowance have been made public. On the 8th of June, 1868, in a memorandum submitted to His Excellency, the first Minister used these words:—"Of late years Her Majesty's Government has not as a general rule interfered with the legislation of the colonies, their representative institutions, and responsible Government, except in the cases specially mentioned in the instructions to the Governor as in matters of Imperial and not merely local interest."

That is the true rule, stated on the most modern terms, as to the exercise of the power of disallowance. No interference unless the instructions specially communicated to the Governor General required interference; therefore, I say that in the interests of Canada, the greatest self-governing community in dependence upon the British Crown, that one in which we see the *imperium in imperio* that one in which of all others we ought to preserve as far as possible, in the interests of the Empire and in the interests of the connection, those well settled lines as to the interference of the Empire in domestic matters in that dependency, we find this disallowance has taken place.

But can we blame the Imperial Government in the face of the facts which have been divulged by the papers brought down after the disallowance? No, Sir, we cannot, and why? Because the First Minister of this country, in the betrayal of his duty to this country, expressly invited the attention of Her Majesty's Government. (*Cheers.*) So far from suggesting, as he ought to have suggested, to His Excellency that the Act was one of domestic importance solely, and one which would not interfere at all with the Empire, the hon. gentlemen says this:—"The undersigned, to whom has been referred by your Excellency the Bill passed during the present session," and so on; concluding, "The undersigned has come to the conclusion, although not without doubt, that this Bill is not within the competency or jurisdiction of the Canadian Parliament, and that the attention of Her Majesty's Government should be called to its provisions and to the doubt that exists with respect to its validity."

The intimation of the hon. gentleman, promptly acted upon by the law officers of her Majesty's Government, was in direct contradiction of the principle laid down by himself, that Her Majesty's Government should not interfere in our domestic legislation, but leave us to settle our domestic troubles by our own machinery. In ignorance of this dispatch, I did not blame the Imperial Government for departing from what I stated to be a well settled rule, I am free to admit that the onus has been shifted, and now lies upon the shoulders of the First Minister of this country. (*Cheers.*)

I observe, Sir, that the proclamation issued on the first day of July was not accompanied by the certificate which it is provided by the Act, shall accompany it. (*Cheers.*) And I confess I did not suppose the hon. gentleman would have been guilty of the act which from these papers it now appears he has committed. I supposed it was by some slip that it happened. The election was urgent, there was haste in the matter, it was a public holiday, there were various things to be done, and I supposed that the certificate of Lord Kimberley, which is required to be appended to it, had merely been omitted; but by the papers brought down, it appears that the Act was not ripe for disallowance at the time; it appears the certificate was signed and sealed in England upon the first of July, the same day upon which the proclamation was issued in Canada making public the disallowance. (*Hear, hear, and cheers.*)

Now, Sir, the law is that "if the Queen in Council sees fit to disallow an Act, the certificate of the Colonial Secretary is sent to

the Governor General informing him of the fact, and until such certificate is received, the Act remains in force." But it now appears that the hon. gentleman caused the proclamation of disallowance to be issued illegally upon that day, in order to stop the proceedings of the Committee, and to carry out the scheme which this memorandum shows he contemplated from the commencement of procuring this disallowance. (*Cheers.*) Sir, upon a telegraphic communication to the effect that the act was disallowed, he ill-advised and misled His Excellency, causing him to commit a violation of the law, and officially proclaimed disallowance. (*Hear, hear.*) At that time His Excellency was physically incapable of performing the act of disallowance, because he had not yet received the certificate of the Secretary of State, which the law requires. (*Cheers.*) Under these circumstances it would have been fitting for the hon. gentleman not to have caused this proclamation to be brought out. It would have been well for him to have waited until the certificate, which the law requires, had arrived. The Committee could then have preceded with and probably finished their labours, because, till the legal proclamation of its disallowance it had as much force as an Order in Council.

The object of the hon. gentleman, however, was not thus to be accomplished. To meet these objections he thought it necessary that the disallowance should be proclaimed, and the proceedings of the Committee stayed. The hon. gentleman alleges that this disallowance was the act of the Lord Chancellor of England, as I think he urged in the argument he advanced to you. I make him a present of the proposition that the Act is *ultra vires* of the powers of this Parliament, and I leave to the hon. member for Cardwell (Hon. Mr. Cameron) who introduced the Bill in this House, to establish to the House as he established before, in spite of the exertions of his leader, that the Bill is not beyond our jurisdiction. I assume for the purpose of argument that the Bill was *ultra vires*, and have only the constitutional question to put, whether, the fact that it was *ultra vires* being established, it was fit that it should be disallowed. (*Hear, hear.*)

I am aware that the hon. gentleman is gazetted, although not yet sworn, a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council, and he probably knows more than I do, or perhaps than I ever can do, of what takes place in that Council, and perhaps he knows that the Lord Chancellor gives to every order of the Council his personal consideration and sanction. I am very much surprised to hear it, but I do not think that the hon. gentleman will here allege or contend that it is the Lord Chancellor's duty to consider the validity or legality of every Order in Council. In this case, as is quite apparent upon the face of the despatch, the Lord Chancellor was not at the Council when the Act was disallowed. Considering the circumstances, considering that it was presented and disposed of on the 26th, and the result telegraphed on the 27th of June, I have a notion that the Lord Chancellor heard of the matter for the first time when that little breeze blew from this to the other side of the water (*cheers*); but it is of no consequence.

I decline, in matters of consequence to the good government of this country alone, to be bound by the opinion of the Lord

Chancellor of England, or any other officers of that country. (*Hear, hear, and cheers.*) The question, whether, according to the well settled principles which regulate the conduct of Imperial authorities in matters relating to the internal economy of self-governing colonies, the act being *ultra vires*, our Minister acted worthily or unworthily in suggesting the course which was taken.

Sir, I do not propose to add anything to what I said last night upon the subject of prorogation, but I purpose to deal with the question of the Commission. The hon. gentleman has said that he does not think himself bound to argue upon that question, because we use some of the papers which have been laid before us in that connection. Sir, this might answer in a *nisi prius* court, but not in this High Court of Parliament. (*Cheers.*) Sir, papers submitted to this House, if they appear to be genuine, may be used as the foundations for judgment, although we dispute the process by which these papers saw the light. (*Hear, hear.*) Although we dispute the legality of the court in which these documents were evolved we can still judge upon the facts which they contain, and condemn, upon results of their own illegal tribunal, the men who have been guilty of the crime of constituting it, and the crime which the evidence taken before it discloses. (*Cheers.*)

Sir, the hon. gentleman has also given us a verbal account of some further opinions upon this subject, and it seems that the law officers of the Crown in England had admitted that His Excellency's course was legal and constitutional. It may be so. We have the hon. gentleman's word for it, but, Sir, we are not discussing the constitutionality of His Excellency's course. We are discussing the advice given to His Excellency, and notwithstanding the arguments used by the hon. gentleman it shows that that advice was unassailable. It was advice which, if permitted to become a precedent, would destroy at one fell blow every vestige of our liberties. (*Loud cheers.*) Sir, I repudiate the opinion that we have not the right to criticize, and criticize freely, the acts of the Minister who advises, for everything done by the head of the Executive is beyond the sphere of criticism. For the proposition that we have a right to criticise the acts of Ministers in advising the Crown men have fought and bled for this liberty before to-day. (*Cheers.*)

I have nothing to do, therefore, with the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, and if I had, Sir, I would say that, whatever respect I may have for the opinion of two eminent English lawyers who I do not suppose assume the role of infallibility when they become Attorney General and Solicitor General of England, finality is not to be attributed to that opinion (*loud cheers*), and still less respect their opinion upon this constitutional question, which goes much further and lies much deeper than any single legal question. (*Loud cheers.*)

We hear too much in this country of the opinion of the law officers of the Crown. It is a little too much, Sir, that at this day of our history we are to be governed by the determination of two gentlemen put down on paper two thousand miles away, before whose opinion we are to be blind in matters of which the decision affects us alone. It is perfectly absurd to say that a people we are

accustomed to believe have a system of self-government in domestic matters superior to that of any dependency of the British Crown, are to be bound down by the opinion of these gentlemen, however respectable they may be. (*Cheers.*)

When the hon. gentleman says he has always been right according to the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, he forgets one case out of the four or five controversies which have arisen—one case in which by the way, the Imperial interests were concerned, which was decided adversely to the opinion of the gentleman. I mean the misapplication of the Intercolonial Guarantee in which the law officers, in as strong terms as possible, stated that there had been erroneous misapplication, and in a severe dispatch ordered that it should not be continued. That decision was asked to be reconsidered, a despatch was sent home to that effect, and the law officers immediately declined to modify in the least degree their former opinion. (*Cheers.*)

The hon. gentleman does not now ask them to reconsider their opinion, for a good and obvious reason. The opinion is now held out to the people of this country as something that must be accepted without remonstrance. It may be that this arises from the same cause which actuates people when listening to speeches with which they agree, and those with which they do not agree. The observation has a much wider application, and as it is very obvious why we are inclined to think much better of the speech that agrees with our own opinion, it is probable that the great belief of the hon. gentleman in the opinion of the law officers of the Crown may be accounted for on much the same hypothesis. (*Hear, hear.*)

Well, Sir, in this Parliament we have got to decide this Constitutional question upon what we are able to ascertain; upon what our learning and reading tells what the rights of British subjects are, what the rights of the British Parliament are. (*Cheers.*) And I do not doubt the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the opinion of the law officers of the Crown will be absolutely disregarded in that particular. (*Loud cheers.*) What I say with reference to prorogation I say with reference to the Commission, that its appointment was a violation of the ancient landmarks of the Constitution and Rights of Parliament, and an invasion of the rights and privileges of the people by an exercise of the prorogation, which ought not to be tolerated. The hon. gentleman says there is no longer any danger from the exercise of the prerogative. The times of such danger are past. I say there is danger and the hon. gentleman's course has demonstrated the danger.

I will refer to the observations of another worker, eminent in the cause of liberty. Let me read you a few lines from the letters of Julius and you will see what he tells the people of that day. He says;—"Never suffer any violation of your political Constitution, however minute the instance may appear, to pass by without a determined persevering resistance. One precedent makes another; they soon assimilate and constitute law. What yesterday was a fact to-day is doctrine. Examples are supposed to justify the most dangerous measures, and where they do not suit exactly the effect is supplied by analogy." As these observations are applicable to the

case on hand, they teach us not to yield to the platitudes and propositions of the First Minister, and to regard our ancient rights jealously, and not part with one of them. The day may come when we may require them. (*Cheers.*)

The arguments of the Premier upon this—the prerogative and the rights of the Crown contrasted with the rights of Parliament—are, as are many of his arguments, entirely inconsistent. It is one of the weaknesses, if I may be pardoned in speaking of that astute person, that he is so impressed with the importance of arguing the points from every position, that even in the same speech he makes statements diametrically opposed to each other and inconsistent propositions.

In his speech last night they heard in his arguments with regard to the two branches of the Legislature inconsistent propositions. At one time he said there was no danger in the exercise of the prerogative, as it was really the property of the Ministers through the people; the next moment he said that which was quite different.

He told us, then, very strongly, that the Crown had its independent right; that as an independent branch of the Legislature, the Crown had a right to issue this Commission, and to send papers and despatches to the House for which they could find no one responsible. Let us steer an even course between these arguments, neither diminishing nor extending these prerogatives.

Then I maintain that no word the hon. gentleman has said was sufficient to justify that invasion of the rights of Parliament, which was created by the constitution of this Commission, based as it was on words spoken by my hon. friend in his place here, and for the investigation of the charges, it having to do, as it had, with high crimes and misdemeanours alleged against the Ministers of the Crown and members of this House, therefore it was the exclusive property of the people's House. What an instance of weakness that was, and what extremities was the hon. gentleman reduced to, when he was forced strenuously, earnestly—might I say theatrically?—to argue that he had communicated the charges of the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) to the Crown, because he sent a Bill to the Senate to empower this House to examine witnesses under oath. That Bill did not say anything about these charges, it was a general law; but the hon. gentleman said he communicated these charges in order to induce him to do that futile thing which he knew was a futile thing—obtain his assent to the Bill in the middle of the session. I know of no authorization for him to inform His Excellency of what was passing in this Chamber. I say it was the height of audacity, and an insult to this Chamber, to tell us by word, act, or deed of the violation, infringement, or waiving of any one of the privileges belonging to us. The member, if he made it, made it on his own responsibility, and if he did he is guilty of a crime which will not fortify him, but weaken his position before the Chamber, before which he was on trial.

The hon. gentleman had utterly failed to produce a precedent for such a Commission as this. The hon. gentleman brought forward on a similar occasion the Ceylon Commission. That precedent,

however, no longer did duty. It has exploded, but he brings forward another. He took the case of the Madeira Commission, but he knew that precedent had no application, so in his defence he does not bring that forward as a precedent, but he falls upon a precedent in the Melville case, which was directly against him. This was a Parliamentary Commission, and not a Royal Commission, to enquire into a case with reference to the navy which had been prevalent for some time. He asked the House if that be the nearest precedent for this Royal Commission. Not sanctioned by the House, not asked for by the House, and disapproved by the House. The precedent was the clearest and strongest proof that British history furnished no authority on which the hon. gentleman acted.

He, however, says that the Crown, as the first branch of the Legislature, had a right to exercise the prerogative. He also said there was nothing particular in these charges to prevent the Senate from having a Committee to investigate them. Certainly not, if the Committee were founded on information which they might properly have, but there would be no authority for the Senate taking up the hon. gentleman's charge and founding a Committee upon it, nor was there any authority for the Crown taking up the hon. gentleman's charge.

Did the right hon. gentleman tell us, in the speech which he advised His Excellency to deliver on the 13th of August, he was advising the issue of a Commission to enquire into the charges? The Speech from the Throne stated that a Commission would be appointed to enquire into certain matters connected with the Pacific Railway. For all I know that Commission was perfectly legal; but when the Commission was issued, instead of being of that character, it recited the motion of the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) and the order the House made upon that motion. The hon. gentleman ought to have presented to this House some better argument, some better reason for the advice he gave. Upon that occasion he tells you that there are statutes which justify it, but, my hon. friend from Durham West (Hon. Mr. Wood) has shown clearly that the statute merely provided for such Commissions certain powers.

What was the revolting scene depicted by the Minister last night? Going about the country asking one judge and another to become his judge in this great State trial. He would ask one judge to come, who would say "I cannot, but I recommend you to so and so." The right hon. gentleman had caused a Commission to be issued, the men named by himself to try himself. He has made efforts to persuade us that the judges must be impartial, but such arguments as that ought to convince, and I hope every man with a sense of public duty is convinced, that that was one which cannot be sustained. (*Applause.*)

The hon. gentleman is not fond of ancient precedents, and asks us to abandon them altogether. He says with the new light we possess, we can safely abandon our old lamps that have guided the footsteps of our forefathers for so long a period. I profess to be a Conservative of the Constitution of the country, the principles of British labour, and the securities for popular rights. (*Hear, hear.*) I

do desire to guard these precedents, which ought to serve us for guides in the future (*Applause*).

Let me add an instance which serves to show the fallacy of the hon. gentleman's argument. He says, on one part, the prerogative was dangerous because it was used by the Crown. The most dangerous instances of the exercise of the prerogative we have known, which have conflicted with the interests of the people, have been abuses of the prerogative by Ministers. (*Hear, hear.*)

In the time of Charles the Duke of Buckingham was impeached, and that impeachment had gone a certain distance when a Select Committee, consisting of the most eminent men, was appointed to prepare articles of charge. Some of the articles had been prepared. The impeached Minister used in that Committee, as the hon. gentleman had used in this Committee, the prerogative of the Crown to stay the hand of the Commons. The impeached Minister induced the Sovereign hurriedly to prorogue the House and stay the hand of his accusers. Sir, what happened immediately afterwards? Two days later the Committee of the Commons, who had been appointed to prepare the charges, received a message from the law officer of the Crown, the Attorney General, requesting their attendance. They attended, and a request was made to them. Let me read you the answer these eminent men returned. "Whereas, this morning, when we attended upon a commandment from Her Majesty, signed by yourself, you gave us an intimation of a purpose of Her Majesty to have a proceeding in the Star Chamber against the Duke of Buckingham, of such matters as he stood charged with in Parliament, and to that end required to be instructed what proofs we had to maintain the several charges prepared from the Commons to the Lords against the said Duke, and according to your advice have considered thereof together and entreat you to take knowledge that whatsoever was done by us in that business was done by the command of the House of Commons, and by their direction some proofs were delivered to the Lords with the charges; but what other proofs the House would have used according to the liberty reserved to themselves, either for the maintenance of the charges of upon the reply, we neither know nor can we undertake to inform you. Elliott, Pym, Glanville, Selden and others."

Not satisfied with that, the impeached Minister advised the King to have Sir John Elliott taken before the Privy Council, where they endeavoured to extort answers with regard to the evidence. Sir John Elliott responded that what he had learned he learned only in the House for the service of that House, and not except for its service would he make use of that information. The proceedings in the Star Chamber went on and were entirely of a sham character, and sham results took place, and there was an end to the attempt made in those evil days by an impeached Minister to use the prerogative for the purpose of transferring from the House the accusation made against himself.

And yet the hon. gentleman says, notwithstanding the objection to its constitutionality, notwithstanding the absence of precedent, notwithstanding immensely greater objections, that the Commission moved for by the Minister himself, especially for the trial of himself, that this Commission is a legal one. The Commission is to

be tried by its works. I think these works will result in the verdict given when that question came up before us.

I think the hon. member for Cardwell (Hon. Mr. Cameron) during the last session pointed out the difficulties that would arise from a Commission being appointed. He expressed strong objections to it, as it would remove this matter out of the hands of the Commons, and a feeling of joy on learning that the right hon. gentleman had yielded to the general view. I think, Sir, these observations have been more than fortified by the result, and I expect to find that the hon. gentlemen will not withdraw from this position. I expect to find him maintaining the inexpediency of any such transfer as that which has taken place.

I maintain that there exists evidence to show that this Commission was eminently unsatisfactory. Questions were put by the Commissioners that ought not in many instances to have been put in the mode in which they were. A witness, for instance on being questioned respecting the payment of \$20,000, instead of sifting the witness to the bottom, the Commissioner said to him, "I suppose you signed it inadvertently," and the witness adopted the suggestion and adopted the means of escape which the Commissioner gave him. Although the newspapers gave this question and answer, the question is omitted in the report before Parliament, and it appears to be a voluntary expression of the witness.

Again, leading questions of a most objectionable character were permitted to be put, and amongst these I will give you one instance. One witness, a Mr. White, I think, after giving evidence relating to the large expenditure in Montreal on the part of the Opposition, had the question put to him:—"You were out-bought in fact?" and the answer was, "I cannot say I was, we were out-bought." That question was a most objectionable one, but the witness would not take the question, which he found was also omitted in the evidence place on the table of the House. These are samples from a large mass of improprieties which could be brought forward.

The opinion shared by all in this country, and, I am satisfied, entertained by the majority of this House, is that the disclosures of the Commission are such as call for the instant action of Parliament. The disclosures which were made were such as to require at the earliest moment possible that the question should be submitted, and the sense of the House taken upon it. In that spirit, in that view, was the motion of my friend from Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) made, abandoning nothing, for it censures the course as well as the disclosures, not recognizing the legality of the Commission; yet we find the case so strong, so plain, that we would have been recreant to our duty if we had hesitated to place in your hands a motion upon which the sense of the House may be taken; and although the hon. gentleman rambled from one subject to another in his discourse, and touched upon topics wholly irrelevant, yet he failed altogether to touch what my hon. friend proposed to this House as the real root of this matter.

It had been known in this country before the late elections that bribery had assumed alarming proportions. It had been known that

it was on the increase. It had become a serious question with honest people in this country how long popular government could be maintained if corruption were further continued. The attention of those had been directed to it who are interested in the elevation of the people, in the purity of the people, and who desire to avoid that increasing demoralization which results from the sale of the franchise. Attention had also been directed to this subject in the old country, and means have been tested and found satisfactory for reducing to a minimum those evils.

The hon. gentleman, so far from being an optimist, has become an Oppositionist. He believes that this expenditure at elections always has existed and always will exist. He abandons in despair the hope of seeing a fair and pure election. Sir, I do not abandon that hope. (*Cheers.*) If I did, I would despair of the Republic. But the truth is the hon. gentleman's tactics were of the other description.

We had tried the effect of another law upon this matter. It had been tried under his eyes. He witnessed the effect of it in the Province of Ontario. I say—and I can speak with as much knowledge as any other man in this country upon this subject—I say that while the election in Ontario in 1867 was a corrupt one, the election in 1871 was the purest that had been known in the last 25 years (*cheers*); and I say that that enormous change was produced by a proper election law, and by a course being adopted which I have always recommended privately and in public, which, I believe is the only course upon which any party fairly ought to succeed, and I hope any course upon which any party will succeed, viz, that having a law which will enable you to punish bribery and corruption, you keep your own hands altogether clean, and expend whatever money you choose to expend for electioneering purposes, in searching, repressing, and punishing corrupt acts on the part of your opponents. Appeal to the courts, let your expenses be in the courts. Let the courts try the case, and if the election of your opponent has not been pure, he must suffer from the consequences of this corruption. That was the principle upon which the election of 1871 was carried, and that way the principle upon which the election of 1872 would have been run had the hon. gentleman permitted it.

But, Sir, although the hon. gentleman affirmed solemnly to this House that the Election Committees were a good tribunal, and though he induced this House so far to believe it as to leave that tribunal to be the only one for the trial of elections, yet the hon. gentleman in his evidence has told us—and I know of no case in which a public man has been so completely and unequivocally condemned out of his own mouth—he has told us in his evidence that corrupt and illegal expenditure, expenditure made unlawful by the laws for which he is chiefly responsible, had existed, and would continue to exist, because the tribunal itself was such as could not be expected to be effective. He said that the expenditure for hiring teams and for entertainments was illegal, and yet was universal. According to the hon. gentleman's reasoning, everybody did it, and he would not expect that five members, each of whom had treated

and hired teams, would judge the seat of another member void because he had treated and hired teams.

That was the character of the tribunal which the hon. gentleman imposed upon this country in the late elections. Upon page 119 of the evidence, where one of his colleagues was cross-examining him, the First Minister testified that he believed the practice of hiring teams and treating was universal, and that he had never known of any serious contest before the election Committee on the ground of such expenditure. The hon. gentleman tells us that he had 40 years' experience in elections, and he had found that tribunal so utterly ineffective, that the law upon the statute book which declared this system of hiring teams to be illegal, was a dead letter—was violated with impunity. And yet the hon. gentleman declined to change that law, and declared it to be a good law by refusing to us the trial by judges.

How does it, may I ask, lie in the hon. gentleman's mouth to say he was forced into a large expenditure, in these elections? (*Hear, hear.*) If there was a large expenditure, he forced it. He caused it by tried means—first by insisting upon retaining the law which he acknowledged to be utterly ineffective, and secondly, by bringing forward these funds from Allan, which, I suppose, were put with other funds I do not know anything about it. I was absent from the country at the time. I spent no money, and I was elected in spite of the opposition of the hon. gentleman; but if there was a large expenditure, he is the last man in this country—he who arranged at an early period for expenditure of that money—he is the last man to complain pitifully, and say, "I was forced into spending money at elections which I would not otherwise have done." (*Cheers.*)

Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman, at the commencement of last session was so impressed with the importance of keeping within the law—of not infringing in any way upon the jurisdiction of the Election Committee, that he would not permit this House to render justice to the people of West Peterborough, that he told the House they must not seat the man temporarily who had the majority of votes, but that the man who was told he had not the confidence of the people should sit and vote, because the only salvation of the House was to leave all these things to Election Committees. The hon. gentleman who then found such virtue in an Election Committee when it was to give him a vote or two, now proposes in his desperation to sweep away all Election Committees and make arrangements for a new Commission of three judges, who are to perambulate the land from Dan to Beersheba, searching out all the inequities that have taken place, and putting the seats of all the members of this House at the disposal of those gentlemen.

I have no objection to as many Commissions as the hon. gentleman pleases to ask for, but I very much doubt whether some highly respectable gentlemen on the other side are ardently desirous of such a Commission. (*Laughter.*) I extremely doubt whether many of these gentlemen feel grateful in their heart of hearts with the hon. gentleman for proposing such a scheme. Well, Sir, when he proposes it we shall discuss it. I have no objection to as many

Commissions as he pleases, but I want to have one that will do speedy justice. If this Commission is to perambulate the land, Parliament would be over before half the constituencies were dealt with. But of course the hon. gentleman will take the Ministerial candidates first.

But this proposal, which is thrown out as a bait to lead the House away from the topic, is simply another instance of the utter absence of consistency which the hon. gentleman exhibits in his arguments to this House. One moment the Election Committee is the palladium of our liberties; the next moment a Commission of three men, to be chosen by ballot.

The hon. gentleman has said that, being pressed by the enormous expenditure on the part of the Opposition, he was driven to do what he would gladly have avoided. Sir, I have pointed out that the hon. gentleman's scheme was concocted when he refused a pure law for trying elections. I proceed to point out that he knew that the consequences of that refusal were that he would spend money, and intended to spend money. Before he and Sir George-É. Cartier left Ottawa, as appears by his own evidence—before this frightful expenditure on the part of the Opposition had set in at all—before the writs were issued, the hon. gentleman was already preparing these and other means for influencing the people of this country. (*Cheers.*) On page 104 of the evidence, he says:—"When Sir George-É. Cartier and I parted in Ottawa, he to go to Montreal and I to go to Toronto, of course as leading members of the Government, we were anxious for the success of our Parliamentary supporters at the elections, and I said to Sir George-É. Cartier that the fiercest contest would be in Ontario, where we might expect to receive all the opposition the Ontario Government could give us and our friends at the polls. I said, "You must try and raise such funds as you can to help us, as we are going to have the chief battle there." I mentioned the names of a few friends to whom he might apply. Sir Hugh Allan among the rest, and that he was interested in all these enterprises which the Government were bringing forward."

At that early day he had seen that, to carry Ontario, he would want, more than his personal presence, more than his personal influence, more than the patronage of his Government, more than the arguments which in the open face of day a man may fairly address to his fellow countrymen—that he wanted Sir Hugh Allan's money. (*Cheers.*) By that early day he had pointed out to Sir George-É. Cartier the importance of getting at Sir Hugh Allan's money, and not his alone. We hear hon. gentlemen say, "What is \$45,000?" Does the Minister pretend that was all he got from all sources for the elections? He says he got some friends in the west and from various quarters to contribute monies to an amount which is not in the slightest degree indicated. That was only a portion of the election fund which was obtained by an abuse of the trusts and powers of the Government.

In addition to the political subscriptions of their friends at that time, the Minister confesses he thought of Sir Hugh Allan. He knew that Allan was interested in the enterprises which the Government

were forwarding, amongst others the Pacific Railway. Sir George went to Montreal and he found that instead of Sir Hugh in his present frame of mind being at all likely to "shell out" as he expressed it, he had established a combination and achieved a position which enabled him to ruin, and which he intended to use for the purpose of ruining, politically the Government of the day unless they would yield to his terms. (*Cheers.*)

This great contractor, this powerful man, had got himself into such a position that the confidence of a number of leading men would be given or withheld from the Government as he decided. At that moment he was exercising that influence in an unfriendly spirit; at that moment he was raising a spirit against the Government because they were not yielding to his views; at that moment he was exciting discontent and suspicion in the ranks of their supporters, and was making his power felt, as the evidence shows. This friend, as the hon. gentleman called him, was far from being a friend, but he was willing and honest enough to declare it—if the word can be used in connection with his name in any sense; he was willing to sell his influence and calm down the spirit he had raised, if he could only be secured in the object of his desires. (*Cheers.*)

I am not going to investigate the subtle question how far Sir Hugh Allan's letters are evidence in this case, but I think any man of common sense will agree with me that letters written at the time, with perfect frankness, upon the subject of the transactions going on, are, where they are not distinctly contradicted or explained away, the best evidence of what the facts were at the time the letters were written. (*Cheers.*) I quite admit that a hostile witness might be brought to such a point as to establish the falsehood of his letters, but if you want to establish the falsehood of any one proposition in the letters, you are bound not to treat Sir Hugh in the tender manner in which the Commissioners and the Government treated him. You are bound to make his state wherein his letters were false. With reference to every particular as to which you fail to obtain a distinct denial, you must take it for granted that the letter is true and cannot be denied. It is utterly impossible for gentlemen to say, because Sir Hugh Allan speaks of inaccuracies which apply to letters written in the confidence of private intercourse—as if he only told the truth in public and lied in private—it is utterly impossible with a general phrase of that kind, to answer the stern demand of justice upon the man who comes forward and insinuates these letters were falsehoods. That stern demand requires, however unpleasant it may be, that there must be an explicit denial.

These letters bear on them marks of truth; there are probably some inaccuracies in them, but they are not inaccuracies which affect their substantial proof; and as no one feels disposed to say a good word for Sir Hugh Allan, I will say I do not believe he was deceiving his partners in the gross manner stated by gentlemen opposite. Well, Sir George-É. Cartier found that Sir Hugh Allan held a great influence in his hands, sufficient without any money to involve the failure or success of the Government. This great influence is to be acquired—Sir Hugh Allan is to be conciliated, and the hon. gentleman endeavours to make an arrangement with

Mr. Macpherson. He says he met him in Kingston about the 26th of July, and he states that he told Sir George-É. Cartier that he might assure Sir Hugh Allan that the power of the Government will be exercised to secure the Presidency of the Company to him.

The hon. gentleman now says that the terms then proposed practically involved an amalgamation, but Sir Hugh Allan wanted something more. It was this, and this only, that in case an amalgamation should fail, the contract should be given to his Company. That was all the further point he wanted, whereas the position of leader of the Government was that there ought to be a new Company formed.

I need hardly tell you that the purposes of Sir Hugh Allan might be quite as well answered by the formation of a new Company as by an amalgamation. What he wanted was the control of the Company; and it would suit him just as well to control a new Company as the Canada Pacific Company; and provided he was secure in the control, his object was quite as well accomplished. But it would be inconvenient for the Government to give any positive pledge that the control should be given to that identical Company which had been set up as a Quebec Company as against an Ontario Company, therefore, in this particular, Sir Hugh Allan wanted more.

He got more, and here I come to the part in which I may fairly say the Commission has performed its work in a perfunctory manner. On the 30th of July Sir Hugh received two letters from Sir George-É. Cartier. In the longer letter it is expressly stated, "I enclose you copies of telegrams received from Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and with reference to their contents, I would say—" and et cetera. The House will observe there was more than one telegram received from Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, bearing upon this subject, which were necessary to communicate to Sir Hugh Allan as part of the authority upon which action was being taken by Sir George-É. Cartier, and yet only one has been produced, nor is any question asked of the First Minister, of Sir Hugh Allan, or of Mr. Abbott, each of whom could have told us what these telegrams were.

What are we to conjecture? Are we to say, in the face of that palpable failure on the part of the Commissioners to do their duty—in the face of that plain, palpable failure on the part of the Ministers to make a full unreserved statement of everything, are we to say that the bottom of this matter has yet been reached, when the evidence is palpably and plainly one-sided?

Let me make one observation with reference to the pitiful attempt which was made to explain two words in the shorter letter. The words of the letter were "any amount which you or your Company shall advance shall be recouped." The pitiful attempt was made by Sir Hugh Allan in his evidence to suggest certain explanations, without being able to deny what the true meaning of the words "your Company" were. The Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) who drew the original draft of that letter, who wrote the copy which was produced before the Commissioners, and the member for Argenteuil (Hon. Mr. Abbott), who is a sound lawyer

and knows the use of language and the meaning of every sentence and every word, were not asked a single question on this point. Can you doubt the reason? It was because they knew perfectly well and because they felt assured, that we would not be satisfied with this enquiry—with such child's play. But, Sir, the answer is demonstrated upon the face of the letters themselves.

These two letters were prepared at the same time by the same person, they had reference to the same transaction; a phrase is used in the one, and that identical phrase is used in the latter. (*Cheers.*) Nor is there any law of evidence better known to legal gentlemen nor better recognized by intelligent men, than that what contains the same phrase, used in different communications to different persons at the same time, with the same transaction, shows the same idea in the mind of the writer. In the letter of Sir George-É. Cartier to Sir Hugh Allan, of the 30th July, we find the words "Your Company," occur thus:—"Dear Sir Hugh, I enclose you copies of telegrams received from Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and with reference to their contents I would say that in my opinion the Governor in Council will approve of the amalgamation of your Company with the Interoceanic Company, under the name of the Canadian Pacific Railway." And then he goes on to speak of the constitution of the board, the powers of the Company, and so on.

Sir, in another letter written by Sir George on the same day, we find that identical phrase occurring, and that in reference to the money, thus:—"Dear Sir Hugh, the friends of the Government will expect to be assisted with funds in the coming elections, and any amount you or your Company shall advance for that purpose shall be recouped to you." (*Cheers.*) But of course the two Companies referred to in these two letters, written and signed at the same time, were not the same. (*Laughter.*)

I do not know what Company was meant. We are not told in the evidence what Company was meant, but it could not mean "that Company." (*Cheers and laughter.*) Why, Sir, if it were made to mean that, it would condemn the Ministry. (*Cheers.*) The whole evidence upon the subject of these two letters demonstrates that they were one transaction. (*Cheers.*) The conference took place between the member for Argenteuil (Hon. Mr. Abbott), Sir Hugh Allan, and Sir George-É. Cartier, by appointment. These very telegrams were produced. We are not told how they were produced; but they were produced, and they formed the subject of discussion. Sir Hugh Allan wanted something more definite, and Sir George-É. Cartier was willing to give him something more definite. The wily contractor understood that all this was done with the authority of the First Minister, and after discussing what the terms should be, he suggested their reduction to writing, and that the process of so reducing them should take place at a subsequent meeting, meantime that a draft should be taken, and the transaction afterwards completed.

Sir, at that first interview Sir George-É. Cartier brought up the subject of money to support the elections. Before he put his hand to the fatal bond, before he yet surrendered his liberty of action; while yet his Government and himself remained in the position in which

they could give even-handed justice with regard to the award of this contract; while yet an unfavourable answer might have crushed the hopes of the contractor, he said, "Don't you intend to help us in the elections?" (*Loud cheers.*)

Now, Sir, we have heard of Sir Hugh Allan's great influence, what a powerful man he was. How did he conjecture what was wanted? Did he say "Oh, yes, I will do everything I can for you. It is true. I have been exciting the country against you, but I will soothe all that down." Was that what he said? No, Sir, not that but something more. It was—"How much?" (*Laughter and great cheers.*) It appears from the evidence of Mr. Abbott—which, under the circumstances, I am disposed to accept, without withdrawing the compliments I have paid to Sir Hugh Allan—as the more creditable, that no sum was named; in fact, I suppose it was just to be as much as was necessary to corrupt the country sufficiently to enable the Government to fulfil their bargain.

According to Mr. Abbott's evidence all that was said about the sum was that it was to be put in writing, and Sir George said if Mr. Abbott threw out the paper it would be signed. Then those two gentlemen go up to their den of iniquity. (*Cheers.*) There both the letters are drafted, and having drafted them they return to Sir George-É. Cartier together. These letters are both presented at the same time to Sir George-É. Cartier. He reads them over, he makes some objection to the last page of the long letter. He changes the draft of the long one. Mr. Abbott writes it out for him and this, too, is signed. Both signed at the same time, and the bargain is struck, so far as those two gentlemen can strike it; and yet men of common sense are heard to say that this was not one transaction—that there was one bargain for the Pacific Railway, and that the political subscription was another thing altogether. (*Cheers.*) Sir, I shall not insult the intelligence of this House by arguing upon this point. (*Cheers.*) Every man ought to put it to himself to consider it with reference to his own private business relations. Every man ought to put himself—if a man should be asked so far to degrade himself—in Sir Hugh Allan's place, and fancy what he must have thought—whether he would not have thought that they formed part of one bargain. (*Hear, hear and cheers.*)

I will not waste time upon meeting the technicalities which I have heard raised upon this point, but I will simply point out that the law would regard these two matters as portions of one transaction. There would be no controversy in the courts that it was a bargain, and a bargain by which the assurances were given on the one hand and the money was to be given on the other. (*Loud cheering.*) Supposing that there had been no letter, would that have prevented the bargain from being carried out? Will hon. gentlemen argue that a contract unwritten was not a contract? Sir, it would be perfectly preposterous. (*Cheers.*)

The hon. gentleman, however, alleges that he repudiated that contract, and that the letter of the 30th of July was withdrawn. I deny it, Sir, and I undertake to prove, to the satisfaction of every man whose mind is not closed to argument, that it is utterly untrue. (*Cheers.*)

Before I pass to the telegrams which passed upon this subject, let me call your serious attention to the fact that we have but the oral statements of gentlemen as to the terms of the telegram of Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, which gave rise to these two telegrams which I am about to refer to; and, Sir, I maintain that no proper exertions were made, no proper questions were asked, in order to elicit the truth as to that telegram. I maintain that, if it was of importance to this enquiry at all—and I do not think it was—they ought to have gone much further than they did. (*Hear, hear.*) Who can doubt that Sir Hugh Allan had a copy of that telegram? He speaks of it in his evidence, he refers to it but he never was asked for it. (*Hear, hear.*) Who can doubt that Mr. Abbott knew about it; who can doubt that it was among Sir George-É. Cartier's private papers and although the custodian of these papers was well known, he is never called upon nor brought forward; and all that we know about that telegram from the evidence is what the witnesses supposed it to have been, without a single endeavour to have it proved.

But if we have not the telegram we have the answer. Let us, Sir, take that answer of Sir Hugh Allan's. "I have seen Sir George-É. Cartier today; you may return my letter or regard it as waste paper. It was not intended as anything official." But, Sir, the letter referred to in this despatch is the letter of Sir Hugh Allan to Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, not the letter of Sir George-É. Cartier. (*Cheers.*) But what does Sir Hugh say further in his telegram to Sir John:—"Your telegram to Sir George-É. Cartier is the basis of the agreement, which I have no doubt you will approve of." (*Cheers.*) Why, this forms an agreement. What agreement? What agreement, Sir, but the letter of the 30th July. (*Loud cheers.*) But why this form? What was its purpose? Sir, for a purpose we well understand; for the purpose of being able to say that the First Minister had never sanctioned any such agreement. (*Loud cheers.*) Sir Hugh Allan withdraws his own letter, and says it was not intended as anything official, but he sticks to the agreement, and says—"Your telegram is the basis of our agreement." Let me turn to the telegram of Sir George-É. Cartier to Hon. Sir John Macdonald of the 31st of July, and see what it says:—"Have seen Sir Hugh. He withdraws his letter written you since you make objection to it, and relies for the basis of arrangement on your telegram to me, of which I gave him a copy." Does this telegram say that the letter to Sir George Cartier was withdrawn? Sir, there was nothing withdrawn, and the First Minister knew it. (*Loud cheers.*) Sir, he knew it, because it was not proposed to be withdrawn. On the other hand, he knew that the agreement was confirmed, for Sir Hugh Allan expressly said in his despatch, "Your telegram to Sir George is the basis of our agreement." (*Cheers.*)

Let me now turn to the letters of Sir Hugh Allan on the 6th and 7th of August, on pages 207 and 208 of the evidence, in which, with various other details, he states that an agreement was entered into yesterday. Sir, that letter is true, if that agreement with Sir George-É. Cartier had not been withdrawn; but it is false, utterly false, if the letter had been withdrawn. (*Cheers.*) Therefore the written evidence of Sir Hugh at the time corroborates the proposition that the letter of Sir George-É. Cartier was not withdrawn. (*Cheers.*) But, Sir, I have more evidence yet. On the 9th of August Sir Hugh Allan attended a

public meeting; these terms, as it would appear, having been already arranged; and I must say that everything points to something having been said, done, and talked over between the 30th of July and the 6th of August, which we have not yet heard of, because on the 6th and 7th of August the letters of Sir Hugh speak of an agreement yesterday, and on the 9th you find Sir Hugh speaking at a public meeting.

Had the arguments of Ministers, and the effect of their great policy, prevailed upon him? Did he, from motives of patriotism, think it was his duty to rise up and support the party who had done so much for the country? Was he swayed by the arguments of the First Minister with reference to Nova Scotia and Manitoba, and the other Provinces which he had brought into the Union; or did he come out and speak because he had learned of the earnest and patriotic desire of the Ministers to uphold British connection, which is their only object in holding their places? (*Laughter and cheers.*) Had these virtues, as sometimes happens with an old man, as sometimes happens with a man of such deep-seated convictions as Sir Hugh Allan, persuaded him of the error of his ways, and caused him to come out and support Sir George-É. Cartier, whom he had but a few days before bitterly, so effectively, opposed.

Let me read you his words on the hustings, at Montreal on the 9th August, at Sir George Cartier's nomination, as he was reported in one of the Montreal papers. "You are aware," he says, "that two rival Companies have been contending for the contract to build the Pacific Railroad. The policy of the Government is to have these two Companies amalgamated, and then to give the contract to the Company thus formed." Sir, you observe that in the meantime it was stated that there would probably be an amalgamation, and at any rate it was better to leave to the Company the consideration of what was to be done after amalgamation had taken place.

He goes on to say, "The terminus to be at or near Nipissing, and arrangements are in progress for the construction of a branch from there to Hull, where it will join the Northern Colonization Railway, thus virtually bringing the terminus of the Pacific Railroad to the east end of the city of Montreal. Measures to secure this amalgamation are already in progress. Your representative, Sir George-É. Cartier, coincides with me on all these points, and in the basis of arrangement, which he has agreed to, and commends to his *confrères* in the country. On the Pacific Railroad question they have been carefully kept in view." Sir, this is a public declaration, and alongside of Sir George-É. Cartier by Sir Hugh Allan, who it appears had undergone a change of feeling, so far as Sir George was concerned; that the basis of an arrangement had been arrived at between them, which the latter had agreed to, and commended to his *confrères*. But he says still further—of course you know that it is only the basis of an arrangement that has been arrived at—"but I am satisfied that if the views expressed by Sir George-É. Cartier are adopted by the Government, as from their reasonable nature there is every reason to expect they will, the interests of this city and Lower Canada will be secured, while, at the same time, every consideration is given to all the other Provinces in the Dominion. I think no time should be lost in getting the contract prepared, and

signed as soon as the Government can meet. I have every reason to be satisfied with what Sir George has done, and I believe the results will be approved by all.

A speaker at one of the political meetings in this city last week, ventured to insinuate that in my negotiations with your representative, I was contending for the interests of the lines of steamship with which I am connected, as much as for the railroad. This statement is entirely void of truth. (*Opposition cheers.*) I assure you, gentlemen, that the subject of steamship or mail contract never was alluded to in any of these discussions, directly or indirectly, and I appeal to Sir George-É. Cartier himself to confirm the statement I now make—that I have made no attempt in any way to connect the Steamship Company or its vessels with the subject discussed. The railroad, and that alone, has been under consideration." (*Cheers.*)

I am afraid, Sir, I am obliged to retract some of the observations I made with reference to the questions of high public policy which induced the conversion of Sir Hugh Allan. I am afraid I recollected it incorrectly, and I am afraid that at the time my friend Sir Hugh Allan was not animated by those considerations, but by the consideration, how am I to get the contract of the Pacific Railway, or the Presidency of the Pacific Railway Company. (*Cheers.*) But as it was he got nothing. (*Hear, hear.*)

Was the Presidency as nothing? Was the basis of agreement as nothing? (*Hear, hear.*) Let us look at that. What did the contending party think of it; what did Mr. Macpherson think of it? Did he think it was nothing; that it was all the same whether he was at one end of the thirteen gentlemen or the other? Did he think that the President would have no more influence, no more weight than his personal position would give him at the Board, and that if not President Sir Hugh Allan would exercise the same influence? He thought nothing of the kind; everything shows that the question of the Presidency was the vital question. (*Hear, hear.*) It was what Sir Hugh Allan wanted; it was what Mr. Macpherson did not want him to get, and what he was determined he should not have. (*Cheers.*) Was it anything or was it nothing? What was Sir Hugh Allan doing before he got that offer? What did he agree to do in consideration of that offer? (*Cheers.*) And what has he done on account of that offer? (*Cheers.*)

Sir, as I have said, it was in consideration of that offer, and not until he came to an arrangement with the Government by which he was assured of that offer, that he turned round and supported them, and furnished them with a large sum of money to corrupt the electors of this country. (*Cheers.*) And yet hon. gentlemen will have us believe that it was nothing at all. It is enough for us to know that Sir Hugh Allan and the Government thought it was something; that it was held out to him; that he got his terms, and gave his price. (*Cheers.*)

Look at the contract; what was his bargain? It was one which was of importance sufficient to induce him to vote an expenditure of extraordinary sums of money. But does he intend to pay that money

himself? No, Sir; he makes a contract with the Americans; they arrange to take ten millions of stock, and that they should pay ten per cent of the whole stock, which would go to Sir Hugh Allan's credit, the profits of the enterprise to be applied to recovering this expenditure, and then in the end he would be saved from the expenditure of a single dollar of this amount. The Company has paid \$40,000 for preliminary expenses. The hon. gentleman said the preliminary expenses in starting any company exceed \$40,000.

Sir, that may be; the hon. gentleman has had more experience in that direction than I have; but you, Mr. Speaker know it only takes \$100 to pay the legal expenses of getting a Bill through this House. But perhaps the idea of the hon. gentleman is, that preliminary expenses in all cases include not only the expense of legislation in this House, but the subsidizing of newspapers and individuals. If that is his idea I congratulate him upon it.

But besides those preliminary expenses, Sir Hugh Allan was prepared with ammunition which he would not waste upon inferior Ministers—such as some of those I now see before me. (*Laughter.*) Look, Sir, at his letters to the Americans, letters which the hon. gentleman pronounces to be infamous. In one of these he says “I have had letters from England offering to take the whole thing up, but it looks to me to be too good to part with readily,” but he is willing to give the contract to Americans, with whom he thinks he can do better than sell it to England. The evidence establishes that on the part of Sir Hugh Allan this was merely a mercantile transaction, a gigantic scheme by which he might make a great deal of money, and some reputation. I do not think he has lost much money, but I am afraid his reputation has suffered.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has said he was responsible for the action of his colleague, Sir George-É. Cartier. I rejoice to hear that the right hon. gentleman takes the responsibility on his own shoulders, because the announcement made at an early period, on the 21st July, was rather a contradiction of that view, or entirely a contradiction of it; to thrust the odium on Sir George-É. Cartier was a most unjust and most injurious, if not a most unconstitutional proceeding. How was the money obtained by which the hon. gentleman retained the position he now occupies? How was the money obtained which got him the number in Ontario and Quebec on whom he has depended? It was obtained by Sir George-É. Cartier, at the hon. gentlemen's own instigation. The hon. gentleman then referred to Sir John's telegram on the 26th of July to Sir George, and continued as follows:—Sir John took the money gotten by virtue of that contract. The hon. gentleman says this telegram was despatched on the 26th, before there was any talk of money. No, Sir, the conversation in Ottawa was long before that telegram was despatched. The hon. gentleman says the Government are not bound by that, but they accept the responsibility of it. The hon. gentleman knew he had to assist in pulling Sir George straight with Sir Hugh before money was to be got. He knew Sir George and Sir Hugh were at arm's length and that to obtain Sir Hugh's assistance they would have to be brought arm in arm, and when this was done he got the money which could only be got by coupling these two gentlemen. Then he says, every telegram was entirely

unconnected with the question of money. Some people say this money was given as a subscription.

I have pointed out the word “recoup” as a proof that this is not the case. It was perfectly plain that that document was so framed because Sir Hugh wanted these men to be under an obligation to him, and wanted to make them his bondslaves, and wanted to put them in the position in which he could say, “Gentlemen, one hundred thousand dollars, if you please. I advanced you the money, and you promised to recoup me. Of course there was an understanding that if I got the Company I should cancel it, but I did not get the Company, and I insist upon you paying it.” He did not expect to get the money, but he knew he would get a consideration for it, in the shape of the contract.

To say that these words are of no account was absurd, as it was a part of the plan to get the Government in his power, and, in order that there might be no misunderstanding afterwards as to the price they were to get for what they were giving, if the arrangement was faithfully carried out.

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

AFTER RECESS

Hon. Mr. BLAKE: I was pointing out that circumstances demonstrated that the object of Sir Hugh Allan in the transactions which took place was to secure the contract, and that it was thoroughly understood that he was secure in return for what he was doing for the Government.

I also pointed out that it was sufficiently apparent that the colleague of the First Minister was acting by the instigation of the First Minister himself. In the first place, to refer to the passages in the evidence of the First Minister, which are to be found in the 116th and 119th page of the Commissioners' report. The question—“Had you any reason for mentioning Sir Hugh Allan's name beyond that which actuated you in mentioning the names of the other gentlemen? Answer—Yes, I had. I thought Sir Hugh Allan was especially interested in getting a railway Parliament returned, and that he was interested in sustaining the Government which would carry out the railway policy which they had inaugurated.”

Then the hon. gentleman proceeds to point out the personal interest Sir Hugh Allan had in the result of the elections, but the speech which I read to you shows it was not a personal interest other than the getting of the Pacific Railway charter that moved Sir Hugh. Then on page 119 Sir John said, “I have no doubt Sir Hugh gave these subscriptions for the one object of sustaining the Government and their railway policy in connection with the Pacific Railway, he being assured that that policy would be sustained with the influence and power of the Government if it remained a Government.”

It was in order to secure the material advantages which would result from the obtaining of the charter that this subscription, so

called, was given, although, as he had before stated, he believed the term subscription was entirely inapplicable to the transaction. He had heard it argued that no harm was done, because nothing was given from which the material interests of the country had suffered.

Can you suppose that Sir Hugh would give this large sum of money unless he was to get some advantage at the expense of the Government? Could it be treated as a subscription if his views were thwarted and his desires not carried out? That argument was entirely fallacious. It may add to the infamy of the transaction if they cheated their confederate. Men in high judicial positions have been impeached and driven from power for actions less corrupt.

One of my hon. friends made allusion to the case of Lord Chancellor Bacon, and I think it sufficiently appropriate at this branch of the argument, to point out that the argument of the hon. gentleman opposite would have entirely relieved Lord Chancellor Bacon from the slightest imputation or blame. The hon. gentleman then read the petition on which the impeachments were founded, and said the Lords in that case pronounced the transaction to be an act of bribery. Then there was the Egerton case, in which a gratuity of 400 pounds was presented under the colour that when Attorney General he had befriended the briber. In this case the Lord Chancellor decided against the petitioner. Upon the petitions it was determined by the Commons, witnesses being examined, that an impeachment should be laid against the Chancellor. Again, there was the Macclesfield case, which was the case of another Chancellor who was charged with selling the Mastership in Chancery. He said he only received presents from the officers on whom the offices were conferred. This case was also decided against the bribed Chancellor.

So in this case it is said "We do not take bribes, but we take presents from men to whom we give contracts." Was the money received by the Administration? A present it was, asked for, haggled for, stipulated for, humbled for, begged for, in every shape. We remember the telegram which has become notorious throughout the land, which says "I must have another \$10,000; don't fail me; last time of asking." (*Hear, hear, and applause.*)

Why, Sir, it is preposterous to attempt to abuse the intelligence of any ordinary man with such an argument. The argument of Lord Macclesfield's counsel was that they were presents only. It was an argument that failed in that day, and it is an argument that will fail in this day. These gentlemen were trustees for the public, and had the power of bestowing this great contract. They insisted on detaining from Parliament these enormous, extraordinary, and unprecedented powers, which were in proportion to the magnitude and gigantic character of the trust and responsibility which they took upon their own shoulders.

Did it not become necessary that they should act with the most jealous regard of the public interest, and to the most jealous exclusion of all private interest which might disable them from forming a fair and unprejudiced determination in the public interest? What would be said of a private trustee having for sale the estate of which he was trustee, and standing for a constituency, who

should say to the intending purchasers who were completing for the lot, "will sell it to you upon such terms as we agree upon. I am standing for the county, and I want you to give me 500 pounds to enable me to stand for that constituency." This would be giving one competitor an advantage over the other competitors.

One of the principles of jurisprudence was that you may not place yourself in a position in which your interest will conflict with your duty. What was done by the Ministers? I will put it that Sir Hugh was simply a competitor with others for the control of this great enterprise. It being such, the Government asked him for, and he, at their instance, gave them enormous sums of money to be recouped. After the elections, then, I say they placed themselves in a position in which no man can justify their having placed themselves. Had the money been obtained for legitimate purposes, for the lawful expenses of candidates at elections, then they would not have been relieved of the great difficulty to which I have referred. The Government could not provide funds for a lawful source, but no man can pretend that these were legitimate expenses.

The evidence of the first Minister, which I have read, demonstrates for what purposes the money was expended. He has told us that the chief expenses are team hire and treating, both illegitimate. It is true, he said in his speech last night, "I did not use money so as to endanger any man's seat." No one expected the hon. gentleman himself would go round to the polling places offering bribes to the voters. I am told some of his colleagues had something to do with the details of this expenditure, and the application was stated to be an honest and upright application. I suppose they won't object to say, how they applied it.

The real question is, whether the money has been given or promised to any Government candidate in Ontario, by or from the Government. The hon. gentleman, on the hustings at St. Mary, in August of 1872, stated that not a farthing had been given or promised to carry on the contest. That hon. gentleman had then received \$35,000, and a few days after he telegraphed for another \$10,000. The hon. gentleman had said that he was driven into a corner in Ontario, that he had the powerful influence of the Government of Ontario against him and that he had the corrupt acts performed by the Government against him.

Sir, as I have before stated publicly, the hon. gentleman made that charge during the election, and announced that steps would be taken on the meeting of this House to establish the truth of the charge. When we met here the hon. gentleman did not vindicate that statement. He never uttered a word about it, nor took any steps whatever to show that he himself had entertained the slightest confidence in the truth of the charge; but now, attacked himself, now brought to bay; now awaiting judgment in this House, he repeats this stale accusation for which he has never furnished one scrap of proof, and urges it as a reason why his iniquities should be condoned.

The hon. gentleman adverted to the sale of timber limits as an instance of the means of corruption used, and that was the only instance he brought forward. I, who am familiar with the

administration of public affairs in the Province of Ontario, know that, for a period antecedent to the general election, the system of the sale of timber licenses was one which altogether forbade its being used as an instrument of corruption, for the sale of these licenses was well known to be by auction to the highest bidder. There was no alienation except on these terms, and the statement is so unwarranted that its recklessness will be patent to every person acquainted with the affairs of the Province.

But if it were true that the hon. gentleman had used corrupt means to defeat hon. gentlemen; if it were true that the Opposition candidates in Ontario used corrupt means to defeat him, I do trust and hope that this House will not so far degrade itself, will not so far fall below its high duty, as to aver that the offenses of others was an excuse for the omission of this great crime. (*Cheers.*)

Sir, his business was to fight the battle by fair means. He had his candidates presumably as wealthy as those of the Opposition; he had his private and personal friends presumably as numerous as those of the Opposition; he had the legitimate influence and patronage of the Government, the effect of which he has told this House, when he has more than once talked of the enormous influence and patronage of a Local Government, and if the Government can add to all these enormous advantages, which belong to it over the other side, the price of public contracts, then we may as well at once give up what will have become the farce of representative Government. It would be more economical to give the gentlemen in power a perpetual lease of it than to go through the ceremony of recording votes which have been purchased.

The hon. gentlemen has said that this is to be vindicated by reference to transactions which have taken place in England. I wonder what they will say in England when they hear the defence of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has told us that because in former times, when the country was just emerging to a certain extent at any rate from corrupt influences from the old borough mongering times, when able men—pure, wise, honest, and honourable men, according to the standard of public morality which at that time prevailed, thought it not indecent to buy a borough, the hon. gentleman, referring to these times, he told us that because a Secretary of the Treasury received subscriptions from political friends—not, Sir, from public contractors, (*hear, hear*),—not as a condition of public benefits to be handed over to individuals, he compares a Secretary of the Treasury to the First Minister of England; and because a Secretary of the Treasury received some subscriptions from political friends to help in the elections, he says the First Minister of England would have received the price of a contract from a public contractor. There is no comparison between the two cases, nor am I disposed to compare the state of public morality of that day with the state of public morality at this day.

I rather look to the wholesome doctrine enunciated in the Churchward case, nor can many of the gentlemen opposite, who may yet propose to defend this act, resist the proposition that if this contract had not been relinquished they would have felt bound to vote for its cancellation. I believe a large majority would have felt driven to do that, and yet I defy those who would have voted for the

cancellation of the contract to show a ground upon which they would have so voted, which does not also form a ground for the condemnation of the Ministers who signed the contract. (*Cheers.*)

The hon. gentleman adverted to English transactions. If he has to advert to English opinion, let him look at the tone of the English House. I am not one of those who are disposed to bow down and worship English or other outside opinion, whether it be the opinion of law officers or newspapers, but no man can deny that upon given facts the great bulk of the press of a country will give you fair indications of what the average nation is to the political morality or to a particular transaction in that country.

There can be no doubt whatever that you can have no better test of how this transaction would be looked at in England, apart from party views altogether, or party views swaying the English press in favour of Ministers, than by looking at the tone of the press. Yet that tone is one of most universal reprobation. Abandoning all idea of the contract, looking merely at the relation between Ministers and Sir Hugh Allan, the tone is one of universal reprobation, and therefore we had a pretty good guide as to what English opinion is; and since the hon. gentleman is pleased to refer to English transactions as his justification, I point him to English opinion.

All these transactions were done, the hon. gentleman tells us, for what purpose? For that purpose for which his Government has maintained itself in power—to preserve the connection between the mother country and Canada—necessitated and united these Acts.

On what is the connection based? It is based on mutual affection, which cannot exist without mutual respect. (*Hear, hear.*) So soon as we find ourselves confessing that we belong to a lower scale in the rank of nations; so soon as we find ourselves publicly acknowledging that a different code of political morality must exist here from that which exists in England; so long as we pronounce ourselves unable to be measured by the same standard of political purity which is there administered, I say, Sir, the moment that we shall make that confession, if unhappily for our country we should be determined to make it, that moment one of the greatest ties for the connection is destroyed. (*Cheers.*) That moment we are not politically upon an equal footing with those of our fellow subjects who inhabit the British Isles.

They have the control of an insignificant portion of our affairs; if you are to add to the political inferiority a personal inferiority, and if you are yourselves to mark that personal inferiority; if you are to tell us that that may be done in Canada which would make our heads hang down with shame in England; then I would like to know upon what basis we can hope for a connection which rests upon mutual affection long subsisting? If we become objects of contempt, we shall soon be cast away; if we lose our self-respect and the respect of England, how can we hope to attain that which the hon. gentlemen opposite do not seek to aspire to, but which I confess I do aspire—is the possession of the full measure of a Briton? How can we claim that if we endorse the action of the gentleman opposite? How can we, with those doctrines of Government, with those notions of political morality—how can we

ask England to admit us to the full share of Briton's rights, to give us some share in the control of her foreign affairs along with herself? We dare not do it, we cannot do it, we are under a ban unless we purge ourselves. (*Loud cheers.*)

Sir, if the hon. gentleman wants to preserve the connection, he will resign his office; if this House wants to preserve the connection it will turn him out of office, and will tell him we are in Canada governed by those same principles of political morality which govern the English people.

Mr. Speaker, I know too well the influence by which the election was carried so far as it has been carried. I know also what influences prevail to a large extent in this House. I am not prepared to go the length that the Minister of Customs did with reference to his own supporters, but it cannot be denied that his House is, to a certain extent, a purchased House. Gentlemen opposite have said that every one of their supporters is branded with Sir Hugh Allan's mark. The Minister of Customs told us that the amount given by Sir Hugh Allan amounted to a trifle divided among eighty constituencies. He told every man behind him who was returned for Ontario that he had tasted of the accursed thing, that he had partaken of this money in securing his election. We all know that a great many of the constituencies were carried by acclamation, and in others the contest was merely nominal. By these we may reduce the area over which Sir Hugh's dollars and other funds were distributed, but, all said and done, there is no doubt a considerable element of truth in the statement of the hon. gentleman. (*Cheers.*) I am not disposed to quarrel with it; I am disposed to let him and his followers settle that between themselves.

All I can say, as I am not prepared to agree with the wholesale accusation he made, I am prepared to believe there are some of the supporters of the Government who did not receive any of this money, but there must have been several who did, and I can understand the answer that a Ministry may give to those of their partisans to whom they have advanced money, and who may now be saying this is a very black business. We do not see how we can give this vote.

I can quite understand the answer to those gentlemen. They say, "What right have you to say so? You took the money, and now, forsooth, you are going to blame us who got it for you. You are equally responsible with ourselves." Some such conversation I can fancy has taken place, and some men, I am convinced, will vote upon this occasion, knowing that they received money from the Government, vote that the transaction which procured it for them was an honourable transaction. That was the unfortunate position with reference to both Ontario and Quebec. But for that money, I have not the slightest doubt the majority against the Government in this House would be much larger than it is to be on the motion of the member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie). (*Cheers.*) As it is, I believe, it will be sufficient for the occasion. (*Cheers.*)

Other influences, I am aware, are here being used. I would fain believe that their *ruse* will not be successful. I am loath to suppose that it should ever be said of a Canadian Parliament, what a poet of

the neighbouring Republic has said of the representative body of that country, when he described it thus:—

"Underneath yon dome, whose coping
Spirits above them, vast and tall,
Grave men in the dust are groping
For the largest, mean and small,
Which the hand of power is scattering,
Crumbs that from the table fall.
Base of heart! They vilely barter
Honour's, wealth, for party place;
Step by step on Freedom's charter,
Leaving footprints of disgrace,
For the day's poor pittance,
Turning from the great hope of their race."

(*Cheers.*) I do not believe it. I do not believe that any such influences as we have reason to know have been used, and are being used, will be successful here. It is true we have men sitting here and voting here with the promise of office and preferment, in their pocket. We have men who vote here to-day who may, for all we know, be Governors tomorrow (*hear, hear*), or who may be officers in various departments tomorrow. We have men who may be so influenced, but I trust they will not be so influenced, for I say not in any spirit of rhetorical flourish, but as my sincere conviction of the truth, that the name of every man who shall vote against the proposition of my hon. friend from Lambton will be a marked name, a disgraced name. (*Loud cheers, and confusion and cries of "order."*) Hon. gentlemen seem moved by that remark. It would not be at all Parliamentary for me to say after the vote that the vote was a disgraceful vote unless I propose to rescind it, but it is perfectly legitimate for me, before the vote is taken, to express my opinion of the vote and of those who so vote.

Mr. ALMON: And we will take it for what it is worth.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE: And I venture to say, standing here as an humble member of this House, known not to have any aspirations for office, that the hon. gentleman will find before many hours are over that it is worth a good deal. (*Great cheering.*) I believe that this night or tomorrow night will be the end of 20 years of corruption. (*Government cheers.*) This night or tomorrow night will see the dawn of a brighter and better day in this administration of public affairs in the country. (*Continued cheering.*)

I am not concerned to answer—I disdain to answer the foul charges which the First Minister hurled against individual members on this side, and against this side as a whole. My best answer is by my utter abstinence from such charges against gentlemen opposite. I have endeavoured so far as I could to confine myself to fair

reasoning on the facts in this case, and to fair deductions from those facts. I have expressed plainly, as it was my bounden duty to do on this important occasion, my views of the political situation. I have said, and I repeat, that the battle is one between purity and corruption. (*Cheers.*)

I should never claim for myself and my friends that we are the embodiment of purity, and that all the gentlemen who sit opposite, and who under a mistaken notice of fidelity to a party leader, of fealty to a lost cause, are about to vote against us—are corrupt. Far from it; I cannot be so ungenerous; I cannot be so unjust; but I desire that those of us who are proffering these views tonight shall be judged by them for all time to come—(*cheers*)—that in whatever situation my hon. friends around me may be placed, the position we have taken, the attitude we have assumed, the ground upon which we stand, will be held as the only sound and true ground. We are here to set up once again the standard of public virtue. (*Cheers.*) We are to restore once again the fair face of the country which has been tarnished; we are here to brighten, if we may, that fame; we are here to purge this country of the great scandal and calamity which those who are entrusted with the conduct of its affairs have inflicted upon it.

I agree with the hon. gentleman, that with all the efforts we will still be left in a position far inferior in the eyes of the world to that which we held before these transactions took place. We cannot, even by the act of justice which we propose to perform; we cannot, even by the solemn judgment which we are about to render; we cannot, even by the purgation which we are about to effect, wipe away in other eyes and amongst other people altogether, the stain, the shame, and the disgrace which has fallen upon the land. (*Cheers.*)

I have no feelings of joy and congratulation at this result. I deeply deplore the truth of these facts; but I am one of those who believe that what is to be deplored is the existence of facts, and not the discovery of them. I don't understand that Spartan virtue which deems a theft no crime so long as it is undiscovered. I do not understand that morality which will permit a crime unseen, but is deeply shocked and alarmed for the credit of the country should the crime become known. I do not understand the morality of the Hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Tupper) who told us that it was deeply to be regretted, while these things must be and would be, that they should be made known. Sir, you will not heal the festering sore by healing the skin above it. You must lance it and cleanse it, and get good healthy flesh to grow around it. Painful though that task may be, arduous though it is, I believe it is about to be accomplished. (*Cheers.*)

The night is far spent, the day is at hand. I trust and hope, when the vote is rendered, it will be rendered upon this occasion by every man amongst us with reference to those principles of public virtue which he would apply in his own transactions as the standard between himself and his neighbour. Let us not be carried away by the absurd notion that there is a distinction between the standards of public and private virtue; let us not be carried away by the notion

that that may be done in secret which it is a shame to be known in public; let our transactions be open, and as the shame exists, as it has been discovered, as it has been conclusively established, as it has been confessed, let us by our vote—regretfully, it may be—give the perpetrators of it their just reward. (*Great cheering.*)

Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Cardwell) began by complimenting the member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) for his able speech. He claimed that that gentleman looked at the question with the eyes of an advocate. He adverted to the statement of Hon. Mr. Blake that the Speaker had also received intimation of the prorogation on the 13th of August, and said it was usual for the Crown to communicate to the House its intention to prorogue, both through the Premier and the Speaker. The argument used by the hon. member was not one he expected from him.

With reference to the prorogation, he said he heard the statement of the First Minister and understood it to be a formal notice that prorogation would take place on the 13th. With respect to the Oaths Bill, he had no hesitation in saying that he had not only not changed his mind, but his opinion was confirmed. He had carefully considered the matter, and he was fully satisfied that the view which Parliament took on that occasion was the correct view. (*Cheers.*) At the same time he held that the Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) was not to blame in the action he had taken. He had the authority of the Governor General to state what took place with regard to this matter, to show the entire good faith and honesty of the First Minister. (*Cheers.*) The First Minister told him that he felt so strongly with reference to the Bill that unless he (Hon. Mr. Cameron) had argued in its favour he would have felt bound to oppose it in the House. He argued the case with the Premier. Still the Premier was not convinced, and he wished that he (Hon. Mr. Cameron) should, if the Governor General desire, see him and discuss that question as he had discussed it with the First Minister. The Governor General did express a wish to see him, and he had seen him and argued the question with him.

The SPEAKER reminded the hon. gentleman that it was not in order to use the name of the Governor General.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Cardwell) said he supposed he ought to speak of him as a higher authority. His opinion was acted upon, and the Bill received the Royal Assent. He desired as far as possible, that the House and country should know that, instead of there being the least wish on the part of the First Minister to keep back the Royal Assent from that measure in any way, he used every means in his power to enable the Royal Assent to be given. He was one of those who did not like to have our affairs ruled by two gentlemen of England.

He referred to a case of his own which had been decided by the law officers, but which decision in his appeal and on his argument the Judicial Committee had reversed; but whether the advice given by the law officers was correct or not, the very moment the English Cabinet declared the Bill was disallowed, we were bound to obey as long as the colonial connection existed. If the Act was *ultra vires*,

which he did not believe, it was of no effect, and no one could be prosecuted for perjury under it. He argued that the moment notice of disallowance reached this country the Government were bound to proclaim it.

With reference to the meeting of the Committee in Montreal and the proposal to go on with the enquiry without oath, he asked if it was not the intention of every member that the evidence should be taken on oath. If the majority had decided to go on without oath he would have ceased to be a member of the Committee.

He contended that the references by Hon. Mr. Blake to English cases did not apply, because those cases referred to personal corruption, and no one had charged the First Minister with personal corruption. He argued that it was the duty of the member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) to go before the Commission and make good his case.

He reviewed the statement of Hon. Mr. Blake with reference to the evidence on the subject of the withdrawal of Sir George-É. Cartier's letter. He contended that it was Cartier's letter that was withdrawn, and not Allan's letter as stated by Hon. Mr. Blake. He read from the evidence of Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and declared it established that Cartier's letter was withdrawn. The telegram of Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald was the only arrangement made. He also read from Sir Hugh Allan's evidence in support of the same statement.

Adverting to Sir Hugh Allan's contract with the Americans, he said that Sir Hugh Allan was the only Canadian in the contract, while the charge stated that Sir Hugh Allan and other Canadians entered into the contract with the Americans. Every idea of having anything to do with the Americans was proved by evidence to have been broken off before October, 1871, and it was not till three months later that this contract between Sir Hugh Allan and the Americans was entered into. He argued that the Government had never agreed to give the contract to Sir Hugh Allan, and even Sir Hugh Allan's company had given it up.

Hon. gentlemen opposite were crowing over the opinions of the English press, but the end was not yet. The English press were gradually getting the cobwebs from their minds upon this and every other subject of Canadian interest. He contended that whatever might have been the expectations of Sir Hugh Allan, those expectations had not been fulfilled, and therefore the inference of corruption, even according to the Corrupt Practices Act of Ontario, would not be sufficient to prove the existence of corrupt intent.

He quoted a case in England where two candidates together contested a constituency which elected two representatives of Parliament, and were successful. The one was an influential, popular but poor man. The other, while rich, had no great influence. The rich man paid all the money into the election fund, and the steps were taken to unseat them on account of corrupt practices. The charge was made that the rich man purchased the influence of the poor man with his money subscription, but the rich man swore

that this was not the case, and the two gentlemen were therefore declared duly elected.

He contended that Sir Hugh Allan and his children would have been dead before any advantage could have arisen from the Pacific Railway. He confessed that he had himself spent money on the elections, but if he had fire to fight he fought it with fire. He pointed to various elections under the new law in England, and to the elections for the Local House in Ontario, to show that judges made out a scale of expenses, which might be properly made at elections, and to the large amounts which had been declared legitimate, to show that the expenditure of money was a thing not only common, but acknowledged as necessary at elections; and he charged against the gentlemen of the Opposition that while they made greater pretensions to purity, they were themselves most lavish and unscrupulous.

He read from the speech of Lord Derby, to which the Premier referred last night, in proof of the assertion that the sum contributed by Sir Hugh Allan was but a mere drop in the bucket compared with individual subscriptions in England. Having proved that there was no corrupt or venal intention on the part of the Government, he would ask this House if they were going to condemn the Minister for doing what every party did alike. Surely not.

He contended that the House had a right to expect from the hon. member for Shefford that he should give to the House and the country the source of the information upon which he founded his charges, and before the gentlemen, who had so long occupied the Treasury benches were going to be turned out, let the hon. gentlemen who expected to take their places show that they were prepared to take those places with clean hands. They were not prepared to forget all the past, to forget all that had been done for this country by the gentlemen who were not the leaders of the House, as they had been asked by the hon. member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake). He told the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches that they would give a triumphant vote upon this question, not merely a vote of confidence by their party, but a triumphant vote by a majority of the House. (*Ministerial cheers.*)

Hon. Mr. LAIRD rose amid loud applause from the Opposition. He said as the House was well aware, his Province was not a part of the Dominion of Canada when the charge was first made, and it seemed a very difficult position for members from Prince Edward Island, who never had a vote here, to give it upon a question of this description. At the same time, as they had now taken their seats in the House as members of Parliament, he thought that members would agree with him when he said that they would neither be faithful to their constituents nor to the sacred trust committed to them if they shirked the vote upon this question. For his part, he would have much preferred, had their elections been delayed by some possibility, and they should still have been outside of this House when this question came up for consideration. He would have been pleased indeed if, when the House met on the 13th of August, this matter had been finally disposed of.

However, being there, they must endeavour to take a proper view of the question before them, and he must say that he thought, considering its gravity, that the debate had not been altogether of that character which was desirable. He had heard some very fine rhetorical flourishes, and a very great deal of sophistry, and the concluding remarks of the last speaker (Hon. Mr. Cameron) were not such as they would like to hear in a discussion of this kind. It would be their duty, he thought, to set aside those flourishes and the cobwebs of sophistry, and get down to the substratum of facts.

When they came to look to the question as it stood before them, they found they had first to criticise the course of the Ministers with reference to prorogation, which, as well as the other matters, took place before Prince Edward Island was represented in this House. This question of prorogation had been so fully discussed by hon. members on both sides, that it was quite unnecessary for one to say anything in the matter further than to remark that prorogation was unquestionably the prerogative of His Excellency, and the House had nothing to do but submit to it. But when the First Minister declared that no business was to be done upon that occasion, and that the meeting was only to be *pro forma*, that declaration must have been upon his own responsibility, and not the declaration of His Excellency.

His Excellency had no power to dictate to the House what it should do. He had the power of prorogation, but when Parliament was met, he had no power to say whether it should be for business or whether it should not. The Minister must therefore assume the entire responsibility of that statement. It might be quite true, as was stated by the First Minister, that he had declared that when Parliament met on the 13th of August, it would be merely a *pro forma* meeting, but such a statement was not binding on the House unless there was an express resolution of Parliament declaring that such was to be the case, and he failed to see that there was any such resolution. Had it been the will of His Excellency that Parliament should be prorogued on the 13th of August, considering the state of public affairs, it would have been the duty of the Ministers to have called Parliament at some time previous to that date, so that this matter could have been disposed of. It was his opinion that the question of prorogation was one which they were not called upon to consider. It seemed rather strange, however, that when Parliament did meet on the 13th, the only business which the First Minister had promised to the House that is, the report of the Committee, was not preferred. The House met to have that report; no report was presented, and no report was read.

With regard to the question which arose from the proceedings out of Parliament, that is, the appointment of the Royal Commission, he considered that Parliament had a right to continue and conclude its own investigation. (*Cheers.*) It might be well to charge Commissions with examination into the conduct of officers under the Government, when charges are brought against them, but when the charges were brought against the Ministers themselves, he believed the proper place to conduct the investigation was the High Court of Parliament. (*Loud and prolonged cheers.*)

From what would appear from the proceedings, it was clear that when the House consented to the adjournment of Parliament to the 13th of August, it was upon the understanding that the charges would be entirely disposed of by the Committee, but it was well known to the Ministers that after the proceedings of the 2nd of July, this could not be done. From this, and the publication of these documents in the interval, after that committee had proved abortive, it seemed to him that it would have been well if the Ministers had given information to members that when Parliament met on the 13th the whole matter would come up for discussion and adjustment (*loud cheers*); and if thought necessary no doubt His Excellency would have changed the day of prorogation, but, as he understood it, there was no opportunity upon that occasion for an expression of the will of the members on the subject, their deliberations having been cut short by the appearance of the Black Rod.

The difficulty raised about the administration of oaths to witnesses before a Committee of this House, caused by the disallowance of the Oaths Bill, might have been got over by a special provision for the creation of Commissioners expressly for that purpose recommended or approved of by the House. Then the whole proceeding would have had—as it ought to have had—the sanction of Parliament. (*Loud cheers.*)

The circumstances were completely changed between the 2nd of July and the 13th of August, and the Ministry ought to have also changed their programme in reference to the investigation. The facts disclosed before the Commission were before the House in the blue book, and certainly the disclosures were neither few nor creditable. (*Cheers.*) He loathed the sight of that book. (*Loud cheers.*) They found from that book that in the autumn of 1871 Hon. Sir Francis Hincks, the then Minister of Finance, had recommended to Sir Hugh Allan a number of American gentlemen, who proposed to form a Company, and it was shown from the evidence that if the Minister of Finance had not urged the matter upon him, Sir Hugh Allan would have had nothing to do with the undertaking. (*Cheers.*) It had been contended that the Government were quite unaware of Sir Hugh's connection with the Americans, but how did he meet these gentlemen? At an interview with the Ministry. (*Cheers.*) Thus far, at least, the Government were aware that negotiations were pending between Sir Hugh Allan and these gentlemen. It was stated in this House that the Government heard no more of them but it was found that Sir Hugh Allan stated in his evidence that during the session of 1872 the Government were aware of these negotiations, although it was not contended that they had ever seen the agreement.

Sir Hugh Allan was encouraged by the Government to proceed, and in the December of the same year it was found that he had made arrangements with his American associates, at New York, at which certain shares were set down, as taken and certain names were given, and it was rather an extraordinary coincidence that the amount of both land and money grants which appeared in the Royal Charter were the very same as that agreed upon at that meeting in New York. (*Cheers.*) He pointed out that the percentage of the

million dollars to be subscribed was to be paid by the American capitalists, and not by Sir Hugh Allan. This, too, was a rather strange arrangement.

It was said in several parts of the evidence that there was an understanding in Parliament that no Americans should be admitted as members of the Company, but the two Acts passed incorporating the Companies do not bear out this assertion for they contain a provision not to exclude foreigners altogether, but that a majority of the Directors must be British subjects. Of course the whole Parliament was responsible for these Bills, but it seemed to him that if the Government had been so anxious to exclude the Americans, they missed the only opportunity of showing it.

It was a very remarkable thing that when Sir George-É. Cartier left Ottawa for Montreal and Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald for Toronto, it seemed to have been the last subject of conversation how they could get money to carry the elections. (*Cheers.*) And it appeared from evidence that the first suggestion about money came from the First Minister. (*Cheers.*) It did not appear that the application was made, however, until the arrangements were about to be made concerning the Pacific Railway matter. It seemed to be the ambition of Sir Hugh Allan to be the head of this Company, and on the 26th of July the First Minister took the responsibility of telegraphing him that the matter could be arranged to his satisfaction.

He adverted to the various communications that passed between the First Minister and Sir Hugh Allan, and said he believed that the member for Bruce South (Hon. Mr. Blake) had some grounds for supposing that there was a more definite agreement arrived at than had been made public. He also stated his belief that the signing of the money letter and the Railway letter by Sir George Cartier was part and parcel of the same transaction. It was stated that one of these documents had been withdrawn by the First Minister, when he came to learn its contents, but the member of Bruce South had contended, and the member for Cardwell (Hon. Mr. Cameron) had not been able to dispute the points of that contention, that it was not the agreement that was withdrawn, but the letter of Sir Hugh Allan and Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. In further proof of the assertion that this agreement was not withdrawn, he pointed to the letters of Sir Hugh Allan of the 6th and 7th of July to his American associates.

He went on to argue that Sir Hugh Allan attached great importance to securing the Presidency of the Company, and it was established that he got the promise of the Presidency before he began to pay out money. He pointed out that notwithstanding the assertions that the agreement had been withdrawn, the letter of Sir Hugh Allan to the Interoceanic Company, written on the 5th of September, contained the self-same propositions with reference to amalgamation, which were embodied in that agreement, and added that the arrangement had received the sanction of the Government. It appeared quite clear that the Interoceanic Company had good reason to have some suspicion of the connection in which Sir Hugh Allan stood to the American capitalists, and when Sir Hugh Allan

was asked before the Royal Commission whether the agreement had been carried out or not, his reply was that it had been carried out as far as possible.

He drew attention to the fact that while the charter made provision for preventing undue influence falling into the hands of Sir Hugh Allan while the present Board existed, it had to be remembered that this Board was but a Provisional Board, and that the charter contained no such provision with reference to the permanent Board subsequently to be elected. (*Hear, hear.*)

He contended that the carrying of the elections by the influence of money was a subversion of the rights of the people. (*Cheers.*) And no matter whether the charges of sectionalism brought against the people of Ontario by the Ministers were founded in fact or not, nothing could justify the subversions of popular rights by any corrupt influence whatever. The admission made by the member for Pictou (Hon. Mr. McDonald) was rather an extra-ordinary one, especially as coming from one of the supporters of the Government. In the face of that fact, the Government refused last session to pass a more stringent election law.

He considered that the practice of spending money at elections ought to be put down with a high hand, and if the charges of expenditure which had been thrown broadcast against gentlemen on the Opposition benches were proved to be true, he was ready to vote for their expulsion. He did not believe that the people of Ontario were antagonistic to the people of the smaller provinces, and he considered the manner in which Ministerialists had brought this matter forward, was an evidence on their part of the worst sort of sectionalism, (*cheers*) but even if he did believe that the great central province entertained opinions that were at variance with the interests of the other provinces, and even if the influence of that province was sufficient to place the destinies of the others at its mercy, that was a matter which would soon right itself; at any rate it could never be righted by corrupting the electors with money.

He was therefore prepared to do his duty so far as the facts before him pointed that duty out; for these reasons he intended to vote for the amendment of the member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie). (*Cheers.*) The result of this vote, whichever way it might go, was one which at present claimed the attention of the whole world, and which would exercise a lasting influence upon the political morality and property of this country. (*Loud cheers.*) There were many appeals made to them as members of the outlying Provinces to vote for the Government. They were told to vote for the Government. They were told that the Opposition from Ontario were opposed to the interests of these Provinces, and that but for the Government Prince Edward Island would not have been today in the Confederation. He did not believe it.

It was quite true that the Government had been the means of bringing in that Province, but in so doing they were only acting in accordance with the will of the people of this country. (*Loud cheers.*) He stated the reasons for which Prince Edward Island had refused to come in at the beginning. They wanted to see how the

Confederation was to prosper. They found that it did prosper, that the country was growing in wealth and influence by rapid strides, and they were now asked to believe that all this was entirely on account of the Ministry. It may have been that the Government had done much to consolidate the union, but the Government could not have kept that prosperity back. It arose from the enterprise of the Prince Edward people, their great trade, and their extending commerce. (*Cheers.*) It might be that the Government had much to do with that, but it was equally true that no Government could remain in power whose policy did not foster and encourage the development of the country.

They were told that the policy of the Government towards Manitoba and British Columbia would be reversed if the Opposition came into power. For his part, as a member from an outlying Province, a Province which would reap no direct material benefit from the Pacific Railway, he desired to see it progressing as expeditiously as possible. He had no jealousy with regard to that matter; he did not know the opinions of the honourable gentlemen opposite on this question. In times past they might, as was alleged, have been opposed to it, but now it had been recognized by the country, and made part of the bargain with British Columbia. He had no doubt that the agreement would be faithfully preserved, in fact, it must be carried out, for it was as binding as the British America Act itself. He saw no reason for fear upon that ground.

He was of opinion that the terms granted Prince Edward Island were not so liberal as those given to Manitoba and British Columbia. He did not complain of the enormous expense in which the Pacific Railway would involve the Dominion, nor did he complain of the large amount that was spent in building the Intercolonial Railway; but he merely made this remark, that it could not be shown that the Government in any way particularly favoured Prince Edward Island.

It had been hinted that but for the Ministry of the day the terms would have been less liberal. He had looked very carefully over the papers from Canada, when that matter was pending in Parliament, and he failed to see one word which bore out that statement. He failed to observe a single motion against the terms granted, a single remark unfavourable to them. They were passed, only a very few explanations being asked. When the elections were taking place in his Province he for one had pledged himself, and he believed his *confrères* were bound by similar pledges, to hear the evidence, to weigh it, and to act according to his convictions as to what was right. He now intended to carry out that pledge. (*Loud cheers.*)

He had studied the history of the transactions as well as he could, he had heard the discussion; he had made up his mind, and he was ready to vote according to his conscience. Upon the decision that was given on this question would depend the future of the country, its intellectual progress, its political morality, and more than all, the integrity of its statesmen. (*Loud cheers.*)

Mr. HAGAR: Mr. Speaker, as I have never wearied the House with long and elaborate speeches, I trust it will bear with me while I make a few remarks. Lacking the essentials of the real debater, and

averse to public speaking, I should not at this late stage of the debate have trespassed upon the time of the House, did I not feel that the position I have occupied here, and the gravity and importance of the question now under discussion, demand from me something more than a silent vote; and, Sir, I must crave the indulgence of the House, if, in prefacing my remarks, I refer to matters personal to myself, which to me is most distasteful, but which seems necessary in order fully to explain my position.

Sir, I had the honour to occupy a seat in this House during the first Parliament of the Dominion. I came here as an independent member, and though a Liberal in sentiment, and feeling moderate in my views and anxious and willing to aid and assist the Government in every way consistent with my judgment, in perfecting and consolidating the new Confederation. To this second Parliament I was returned by acclamation, and again took my place as an independent member, a position which I am aware is looked upon with suspicion by many, ridiculed by some, sneered at by others, and by not a few considered as a notice that the occupant is for sale, to which political party may bid the highest. Sir, I deny and repudiate those imputations and insinuations, for although I grant there may be exceptions, I claim and believe the great majority of independent members of this House are as true to the convictions and their sense of duty as any class of their fellow members; and that all the fascinations of wealth, all the allurements of place and power, or the pressure of partizan supporters or constituents, could not tempt or force them to swerve from the path of rectitude and honour—and, Sir, amid this majority I claim a place.

I came here under no obligations to the Government, with no favours to ask, no ambitious longings for place or preferment to gratify, no needy friends, supporters, or relatives to provide for. Untrammelled by party feeling, and unpledged to political supporters. I did say I would not vote want of confidence where no principle was involved. I came here, not as a politician, but as a representative of the people; determined to do my duty to my constituents and the country to the best of my ability and judgment; to support measures rather than men, and with a friendly feeling towards the Government, inclined to support them in every measure that my conscience and my reason would allow. It was from this stand-point, with these feelings, and with an anxious and earnest desire that those charges might be disproved, that I have endeavoured calmly and dispassionately, unbiassed by party feelings, and unblinded by partisan zeal or prejudice, to review the facts and evidence in the case, and to arrive at an honest and just decision and, Sir, to judge intelligently of the case, it is necessary one should keep in mind all the facts bearing upon or connected therewith.

Therefore, I must refer to the action of the Government during the last session of the First Parliament, when the hon. member for Durham West introduced a Bill to assimilate the election-law for the Dominion with that, then and now prevailing in the Province of Ontario; to that Bill I gave a most hearty support, feeling that on the eve of a general election the best interests of the country required it, and that its provisions would be fair alike to both political parties;

and, Sir, I was surprised and grieved to find the Government opposing and defeating it. Their reasons for so doing I then only suspected, but as seen by the light of after days, are now manifest and clear, for the First Minister of the Crown, with that sagacity, foresight, and tact for which he is remarkable, foresaw even then that it was necessary to the existence of his party and to his own retention of power that the Bill should not become law; and some of the fruits of that action may now be seen in the printed evidence before us, showing what lavish expenditure of money was employed in controlling the elections, and also in the fact that more than 50 election petitions were presented to you, Sir, upon the opening of Parliament, more than twenty of which are yet undecided, and may drag their slow length along for sessions yet to come, allowing them to sit here and vote.

I will not say on which side of you, Mr. Speaker; that is well known; those who, if the petitions against their return had been tried before the proper tribunal would not now, I believe, occupy seats in this House. Sir, as the events of that memorable session are now matters of history, and well known to the House and to the country. I shall only briefly allude to a few of the most important.

On the 2nd day of April, an hon. gentleman rose in his place in this House, and preferred charges against the Government of such a serious and startling nature that many refused to credit them, and I must confess that I thought the hon. gentleman had been misinformed, and that the evidence on which he relied would be disproved, and when an investigation was demanded, and without comment or discussion, a vote about to be taken thereon, which I am free to admit, I looked upon as vote of want of confidence, with doubt unremoved, and loyal to the promise to which I have referred, I voted with the Government; but a short time then elapsed, when I heard the First Minister in his place declare those charges were unfounded and utterly untrue and on his motion a Committee was appointed to report thereon.

Sir, I saw the action of this Committee delayed and hindered by a most wonderful combination of circumstances, brought about, as I now believe, by the accused Ministers, who, denying their guilt did not hasten to prove their innocence. Parliament was adjourned to the 13th day of August, a day henceforth memorable, then to receive the report of the Committee. The day arrived, a majority of the members of this House assembled, when the Ministry, trampling upon its rights and privileges, advised His Excellency to prorogue it. This, with haste, was done ere its Committee could be heard or any action taken, with a Parliament ejected from its Chambers, its Committee strangled, its rights ignored, and its powers defied. The accused Ministry then proceeded to appoint their judges, and constituted a court to try themselves.

By the glimmering of truth evoked from this tribunal, and by the light obtained from that remarkable series of letters which had in the meantime appeared in the public press, signed by Sir Hugh Allan, and by his own affidavit admitted to be substantially correct; we have presented to us the wondrous, the humiliating spectacle, unparalleled in the history of any country where British laws and institutions prevail, of one man who, by the power of his wealth, his

instinctive knowledge of men and their value, his remarkable genius and skill in comprehending the situation, and knowing where and when to apply the powerful leverage of his almighty dollars, actually through a purchased and paid Executive, controlling the interests and affairs of this great Dominion. I saw this man, a contractor with the Government, who, as he said, looked upon the two political parties as factions, who had never been known to contribute but a trifle towards election contests, and who, in his long career, had never even voted but once before, now eager and anxious to add to his already overflowing wealth by obtaining this great contract, with its \$30,000,000 of money and 50,000,000 of acres of land; and, ambitious to connect his name with the greatest enterprise of the age, and to be known to posterity as the master spirit that controlled it, acknowledging on his oath that he had expended for the purpose of obtaining these ends, and on behalf of Ministers and their supporters, no less a sum than \$350,000, out of which the First Minister of the Crown confessed to have received, with two of his colleagues, \$162,000, and for what purpose? To control and influence the elections in their behalf, and to demoralize and corrupt the people.

But, Sir, before advancing that large sum, Sir Hugh, with that shrewdness and business tact characteristic of the man, demanded and obtained the promise of the charter and the presidency of the Company formed to construct the road, thus virtually controlling it, and when the money had been paid the promise was fulfilled. Sir, what conclusion, what verdict can be arrived at from all this but that Ministers have been guilty of a grave offence and misdemeanour, and are no longer worthy to occupy their high positions? Sir, I think I shall not be accused of hypocrisy or affectation when I say that, as a Canadian by birth, as a lover of my country, proud of her position and her prospects, sanguine as to the great future in store for her, jealous of her honour and her fame, and of the reputation and standing of her public men; I feel grieved and humiliated to render such a verdict, and,

Sad as angels for the good man's sin,

Weep to record and blush to give it in.

Sir, at the risk of wearying the House, I would refer to several of the reasons, or so-called arguments, generally advanced by the friends of the Government to palliate or excuse their conduct. The one generally first referred to is that the Opposition party have used money in their elections for corrupt purposes, and for equally guilty acts; and, therefore, Ministers should not be condemned. Sir, this charge against the Opposition had not been proved. When it is I shall be just as ready to condemn and punish them. At all events, it has not been charged that they sold a great public trust to obtain their money. This reason might as well apply to some prisoner in the dock who, charged with a serious crime, confesses his guilt but claims free pardon and exemption from punishment because, forsooth, as he states, some other person has committed a similar offence.

Another reason advanced is that a Government which has inaugurated and is now carrying to completion so many great public

works and improvements, so essential to the advancement of the country, deserves support. Sir, I feel these great works with their costly contracts and their expensive extras, have been used but as a means by Ministers to strengthen and secure their position. How many friends had been rewarded, favourites enriched, and opponents conciliated and converted through them would be difficult to tell, and, Sir, there are those even who seem to think that if this Government were overthrown, none other could be found to supply their places, and that if such a thing should occur, the prosperity, advancement and business of the country would almost cease; that the fruits of the earth would hardly mature, and that nature, paralysed by the shock, would almost forget her functions. Sir, the wealth and resources of the country, the energy, enterprise, and intelligence of our people are by many not fully understood or appreciated. I believe that, if by some sudden calamity every member in this House should be hurried into eternity, where another twelve months elapsed another session would find our places filled with perhaps wise and better men.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my province, even were I able, to endeavour to influence hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who support the Government, or to accuse those, as they have been accused, of wrong-doing and improper motives, or of betraying the high trust committed to their keeping. I shall not therefore dilate upon the purchase or the price of the memorable though perhaps mythical 27, or appeal to those, if any, against whom it has been charged that their only motive was self-interest, and that their support is given either on account of favours received or of benefits to be conferred.

I know, Sir, there are many honourable, high minded, and conscientious men who, from party fealty, love, attachment, and devotion to their chief, and that chivalrous feeling which forbids them to desert a friend in his extremity, will tenaciously cling to the waning fortunes of their party with a constancy and determination fixed and unchangeable. Sir, I respect and esteem these men; I only fear that they allow their feelings, to which I have referred, to blind them as to what in this grave crisis is due to their country and themselves; and, Sir, there are other equally honourable, high-minded and conscientious men who from a lofty sense of their duty, and from their honest and candid convictions, regardless of the taunts and invectives hurled against them, have stood nobly forth and dared to sever party ties and political associations. Mr. Speaker, I also honour and respect these men, and though they be accused of deserting their former party and principles, and, as it has been termed, hounding down and hunting, shall I say to his moral death, their former chief and leader, they can truly say, even were the latter assertions true, in the spirit of the noble Roman, "We have done it, not because we love Caesar less, but Rome more."

Mr. Speaker, if so calamitous a thing for the honour and standing of the country should occur, or which, though, I have little fear, that a majority of this House should be found to condone the offenses of the Government by supporting and sustaining them, I should indeed despair of my country did I not know and feel, the opinion of the hon. member for Pictou (Hon. Mr. McDonald) to the contrary

notwithstanding, that to the people whose servants we are, may be safely confided the task of redeeming the honour and reputation of our country. Sir, what I desire and believe the country demands is an honest, pure, and economical Government, composed of competent, high-minded and patriotic men, to whom the interests and honour of the country would be paramount to Party exigencies or Party triumphs and who would zealously, energetically and as speedily as the finances of the country would allow, push on to the completion the great works now under way or projected, and which the trade, the commerce, the development and settlement of the country require. Sir, to a Government so composed, I could give a hearty and generous support. Sir, I have done. I trust I have said nothing unparliamentary or disrespectful; if so it was unintentional. I have only expressed my honest and conscientious opinions and convictions, and entertaining those opinions and convictions I can no longer either countenance or support the Government of the day. (*Loud cheers.*)

Mr. SMITH (Selkirk) explained his position with reference to the Canada Pacific Railway Company, and said he had taken the ground that all the Directors should be British, and that no one Director should hold more than one proxy. With respect to the transactions between the Government and Sir Hugh Allan, he did not consider that the First Minister took the money with any corrupt motive. He knew that Sir Hugh Allan at one time looked so coldly upon the Railway enterprise that he really thought of giving up the charter. Sir Hugh had told him that if the proposition made was carried out, he would not accept it. In every instance that he knew of the provisions were made more and more stringent when against Sir Hugh Allan. (*Government cheers.*) He then referred to Manitoba affairs, and said that there was an unfortunate condition of things there. He felt that the leader of the Government was incapable of taking money from Allan for corrupt purposes.

He would be most willing to vote for the amendment of the member for Pictou (Hon. Mr. McDonald) (*loud Government cheers*) could he do so conscientiously. (*Opposition cheers and laughter.*) It was with very great regret that he felt he could not do so. He repeated that he did not believe there was any intention to give the charter to Sir Hugh Allan as a consideration for his money; but on the other hand, to take money from an expectant contractor, was a very grave impropriety. (*Cheers.*) For the honour of the country, no Government should exist that has a shadow of a suspicion of this kind resting on them, and for that reason he could not vote for the amendment of the member of Pictou. (*Cheers.*)

Hon. Mr. POPE (Prince County) did not think he would be discharging his duty in giving a silent vote. He believed the policy of the right hon. leader of the Government had done much to promote the interests of the country. He then entered upon a recital of the particulars of the Pacific Scandal, and concurred with the Government in the course they had taken.

He regretted that there should be any division amongst the members for Prince Edward Island, as he believed they would have been able to have accomplished much more in the interests of the

Province if they had been united. He did not consider that the evidence given before the Commission substantiated the charges brought against the Administration. He regretted that the First Minister should be mixed up in a matter of this kind, and he did not believe that the gentleman did a dishonest or corrupt act for the purpose of benefitting himself in any way. He then went on to eulogize the right hon. gentleman.

He asserted that the charges were based upon information improperly obtained, and upon papers which had been stolen. He deprecated the means by which the Opposition had endeavoured to get into power. This struggle, he maintained, was not in the interest of the country, but was brought about by a desire to obtain power. He expressed his intention of supporting the Government and voting for the amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Pictou (Hon. Mr. McDonald).

Mr. DODGE referred to the independent position in which he came to the House, and afterwards spoke of the energy displayed by the Government in the policy they had pursued. When he came to the House he had decided to give the Government his hearty support, and that he should stand faithfully by that decision until he saw some good reason to change these views. He rose to protest against the action which had been taken in the Scandal. He thought it would do much to damage the fair name of Canada to the world, and he could not help thinking the Opposition knew not what they were doing. What had the Government done that they should be treated worse than murderers? Gentlemen might laugh, but if he were in the place of the members of the Government, he would rather be carried out to the scaffold and be hanged, than have such infamous charges brought against him. He would vote for the amendment of the member for Pictou (Hon. Mr. McDonald), as he believed the adoption of that motion would be for the best interests of his adopted country.

Mr. DAVIES thanked the mover of the Address for the handsome manner in which he referred to the admission of Prince Edward Island into the Confederation. He was the only one of the original confederates who had succeeded in obtaining a seat in the House. Dominion politics were very little discussed. He considered with reference to the terms granted Prince Edward Island, that the Dominion would receive quite as much from that Island as they would have to pay in the way of subsidy. He had no hesitation in saying that they would have supported the Ministry on the general policy until they became more acquainted with the affairs of the Dominion, but this great question having come up, they felt they would have to support the amendment of the hon. member for Lambton. He did not think the matter should have been taken out of the hands of the House, and delegated to a Royal Commission. The Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald), however, had admitted sufficient, in his mind, to prove the charge. With regard to the prorogation of the House, he said it was understood that the supporting of the Government was conditional on their exoneration from the charge made against them. He could not conscientiously vote for the Government, and he considered it was their duty to endeavour to stamp this corruption out.

The Opposition members were anxious for a division when,

Mr. DALY rose and moved the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he would like to know when the debate was likely to terminate.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said he had no doubt it would be closed tomorrow. There were several members on that side who desired to speak.

The House adjourned at 1.30 a.m.