

that according to a rule that had been established by use, no motion on the speech ever came from the side of the House on which he was now sitting. But there was a paragraph in the speech to which no allusion had been made and which he thought most important. He referred to the first paragraph. His intention was not to question in any way anything that had been done by the Governor General under the advice of his responsible advisers, for all his acts must be according to that advice. He acted according to the advice of those who were counselling him at the time, and if anything was accomplished in accordance with that advice, they were responsible for it. In the first paragraph of the speech it was stated that His Excellency had caused Parliament to be summoned at the earliest moment after the receipt of the report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into certain matters connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, as he had already said, no allusion had been made one way or other by the mover or seconder of the Address, having reference to this matter. And to approach this subject it must be approached in a calm and cool way. Now, he held that they had a right to know what were the reasons that brought the Crown to decide in such a way. No such reason had been given. Now, if the House was to be convinced, how was it that the reason had not been given by the mover or seconder of the Address, when on the table of the House, State Papers had been put on the table, and put into the hands of the members, and papers in reference to the Pacific Scandal. Now, if it were necessary to place these papers on the table, they had a right that something in reference to these despatches should have been said, to tell them why these despatches had been brought at so early a date. They were told that the Oaths Bill had been disallowed by the Home Government, and the reasons given in the despatches were that when the British North America Act was passed, the powers that were then enjoined were the same as exercised by the Commons of Great Britain, but he could not understand when the authorities on this side of the water had been advised that this was one of the rights of this Parliament, why the Home Government should disallow the bill. As British subjects the people of Canada claimed equal rights with other subjects of Her Majesty. The Oaths Bill was disallowed. What was the reason? If it were on a question of

law, the men on this side of the water were as well able to decide such a question as those in England. The fact was that an arrangement which had been made by a branch of the Canadian Legislature was brought to a standstill by the interference of British authority. The consequence of this was that the investigation which was to take place before a Committee of the House of Commons, was stopped. The next thing that was done to procure the information desired in reference to the charges made was to take the matter out of the hands of the people who had a right to decide upon it, and appoint a Royal Commission, so that through that Royal Commission the charges might be investigated. He made no objection to the hon. gentlemen who formed that Commission, but he held that the Ministry had no right to take the matter out of the hands of the Parliament. That Commission was appointed under the advice of the responsible advisers of the Governor General, and the evidence was taken before the Commission, and what was the result? The first day that they were summoned to meet, it was placed on the table. Now did the evidence show that the charges were untrue, or unsustained? Quite the contrary. They saw by that report that the responsible Ministers of the Crown had been obliged to declare on oath that they had taken large sums of money from Sir Hugh Allan which they spent right and left to corrupt the constituencies of the country. It was proved that the late Sir George Cartier was sent by his chief to Montreal to know whether he could get the money from Sir Hugh Allan, and the letters signed by Sir Hugh Allan himself showed that he was in association with men in America, and the Government must have been aware of it at the time. Means had been tried to shelter those who were implicated in this matter, but it could not be done, for the correspondence which had been brought before the committee, and sworn to by Sir Hugh Allan, put an end to any such shelter being afforded. It proved that Sir Hugh Allan had put himself in a position to secure the contract from the Government. The late Sir George Cartier went to Montreal, and had some conversation with Sir Hugh Allan, and he got \$37,000, while Sir John A. Macdonald got \$60,000; Mr. Langevin got \$35,000 for electioneering purposes. Sir George E. Cartier got that large sum which was placed in the hands of the Central Committee at Montreal; and this was sustained, not only by the evidence of