

3. The House might have petitioned the Imperial Government to give the power to examine witnesses on oath ;

4. The House might have addressed the Governor-General, asking the issuing of a Royal Commission to take the evidence on oath and submit it to the House.

In adopting either the first or second alternatives, the evidence could not be taken on oath. In either case the House must first have been called, and it could not have sat for some two months after the 13th of August, at which time the report of the Royal Commission was finished. To have taken either of these proceedings, would, therefore, have been a waste of time. But even if the House had decided to disregard its order to take the evidence on oath, and had proceeded to examine witnesses of damaged character without the sanction of an oath, the investigation would have consumed many months, at an enormous expense, accompanied with excited discussions, long protracted, having reference to Party issues, rather than to the eliciting of the truth. The Royal Commission has taken the evidence on oath, at the shortest possible time, still leaving the House free to act upon—to receive or reject—the report ; if that report be not received, the House can adopt either the third or fourth alternatives named above.

3. If it should petition the Imperial Parliament to give the power to take evidence on oath, the question could not come up for final action for another year. The Imperial Parliament does not sit till February next. We might receive their Act within three months after, in May, 1874. The evidence must then be taken, say before a committee such as that named on the 8th of April last. As the session usually ends in June, the House must adjourn as before to give the Committee time to complete its labours, and it could scarcely be called together again before September or October of 1874.

We think we do not misjudge the temper of either the Commons or the coun-

try in the statement that neither would consent to such delay, and that if unfortunately the House should do it, the country would not support them in such a policy. Great interests are at stake, the greatest which have ever affected the country. The postponement of the Pacific Railway alone, through the charges hanging over the Government, and that by the fault of a factious Opposition, has been a loss almost incalculable to the Dominion ; and the country is in no mood to consent to longer delays. In this we agree with the memorialists. The evidence of Mr. ABBOTT is explicit upon what was known before, that the failure to enlist English capitalists in the scheme was owing entirely to these charges, and to the persistent and insensate manner in which they were made and circulated before the evidence was taken, producing the conviction that at any cost these factionists would prevent the present Ministry from having the credit of constructing this great work, and thus securing the consolidation of the Dominion. The credit of Canada is high, if not the best, in the English market ; that credit is pledged to give a bonus of \$30,000,000, the chief part of which the Imperial Parliament guarantees. 50,000,000 acres of some of the best land on the continent—an area one-third larger than England—is another part of the magnificent gift to the company which may undertake the construction of the railway. These lands alone ought to more than cover the cost of the road. The Pacific Railway with \$30,000,000 would be a gift to the Company. Under such circumstances there was no reason, there could be none, for the failure of the scheme in England, but the violent, unpatriotic course of the Grit leaders ; for men of capital and the lovers of peace and good Government shun communities where such extreme views and violence in Party strife might at any time endanger the stability of the Government. And we are much mistaken in the moderation, in the sense of justice,