

referred to were consideration moneys for the Pacific Railway Charter; and Sir Hugh Allan states upon his oath that they were not, as will be seen from the subjoined extract from his affidavit:—

“In these and similar ways I expended sums of money approaching in amount those mentioned in those letters, as I conceive I had a perfect right to do; but I did not state in those letters, nor is it the fact, that any portion of those sums of money were paid to the members of the Government, or were received by them or on their behalf directly as a consideration in any form for any advantage to me in connection with the Pacific Railway contract.”

On the other hand, what were the countervailing facts within my knowledge? The theory of the prosecution “is that the terms of the Charter were corruptly modified to “the advantage of Sir Hugh Allan and his American confederates.” Has the bargain been carried out? Certainly not, as far as the Americans are concerned. Their complaint is that they have taken nothing by their motion. I was myself a witness of the pains taken to exclude them when the Charter was being framed. Have Sir Hugh Allan and his friends been gratified with that control over the concern to attain which Mr. McMullen asserts he bribed my Ministers? This is a fact less easy to elucidate, but I myself believe that he has not. At moments when Sir John Macdonald could not have been playing a part he gave me repeated indications of his desire to prevent Sir Hugh from obtaining any commanding influence on the direction. That direction was framed with a view to a proper representation upon it of every Province in Canada, regard being had to the wealth and population of each. It numbers amongst its members gentlemen who had been on the direction of the late Inter-oceanic Company, and it includes the names of men whom everyone would acknowledge would never willingly associate themselves with any dishonourable enterprise. It is difficult to believe that these personages are either the willing or unconscious tools of Sir H. Allan. Hence, we must arrive at the inference that, at all events, if the crime was imagined, it can scarcely have been consummated. This would not in the least excuse its authors, but if a thing has not been done, the fact affords *prima facie* grounds for believing that it was not intended to be done. Lastly, I have received the most solemn assurances from my Ministers, both individually and collectively, on their word as men of honour, and on their fealty to the Crown as my sworn Councillors, that they are absolutely innocent of the things laid to their charge.

On a balance of the foregoing considerations, can anyone say that I should have been justified in deliberately violating my first duty as a constitutional ruler on a premature assumption of the guilt of these gentlemen?

But a still more important question remains behind. Had I any means of knowing that my Ministers had forfeited the confidence of the House of Commons,—for, of course, if this were the case, any inward impressions of my own would cease to be elements of the problem?

What were the facts upon which I could rely? During the whole of the preceding Session the Government had marched from victory to victory, as will be seen by the subjoined record of votes taken on test divisions:—

7th March, majority for Government	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
18th do. do. do.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25
2nd April, do. do.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31*
17th do. do. do.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26
7th May, do. do.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31
8th do. do. do.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33
12th do. do. do.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24
16th do. do. do.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35

They had left off with a majority of 35 at their command. The ordinary presumption would be that their supporters still adhered to them. Had anything occurred to invalidate this conclusion? The publication of the documents I have referred to? Judging from the process of thought in my own mind, which compelled me to suspend my verdict, I could not bring myself to believe that Parliament had jumped to any premature conclusion. But I had one other indication to assist me. Ninety-two Members of Parliament declared themselves opposed to the views of Ministers on prorogation. Where were the other one hundred and seven, and what were their opinions? Of the thirty-five or forty who were in their places, not one took steps to make me aware that

* Mr. Huntington's motion.