

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