

the Dominion with the gold obtained as the price of their treachery. In making these allegations, however, Mr. *Huntington* did not enforce them by any confirmatory statement or by the production of any *prima facie* proofs of their validity. He merely read his motion and sat down. Neither Sir *John Macdonald* nor any of his colleagues having risen to address the House, a division was taken without debate, which resulted in a majority of 31 for Government in a House of 183.

Notwithstanding this display of their Parliamentary strength,—which I imagine was put forward by way of protest against Mr. *Huntington's* appeal to his own mere *ipse dixit*—my Government felt that the matter could not thus be disposed of, and accordingly the next day Sir *John Macdonald* gave notice of the following motion which was carried on the ensuing Tuesday, April 8th:—

“ On motion of the Right Hon. Sir *John A. Macdonald*, that a select Committee of “ five members (of which Committee the mover shall not be one) be appointed by this “ House to enquire into and report upon the several matters contained and stated in a “ Resolution moved on Wednesday, the 2nd of April, instant, by the Hon. Mr. *Huntington*, “ Member for the County of Shefford, relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway, with “ power to send for persons, papers and records; to report from time to time, and to “ report the evidence from time to time, and if need be to sit after the prorogation of “ Parliament.”

“ The Members to compose the Committee were then named by the House as follows: “ Hon. Mr. *Blanchet*, Mr. *Blake*, and Hon. Messrs. *Dorion* (*Napierville*) *Macdonald* “ (*Pictou*) and *Cameron* (*Cardwell*).”

Of the five above mentioned gentlemen three, viz.—Mr. *Cameron*, Mr. *Macdonald*, and Mr. *Blanchet*, may be regarded as regular supporters of the administration, and two,—Mr. *Blake* and Mr. *Dorion*, as leading members of the Opposition.

On the debate which took place on this motion, I am informed by my Prime Minister,—and here I must remind Your Lordship that I have no other means of acquainting myself with what takes place in the House, as I am precluded from being present at its proceedings, and the newspaper reports are quite untrustworthy,—that Mr. *Mackenzie* the leader of the Opposition, as well as Mr. *Blake*, Mr. *Dorion* and Mr. *Joly*, eminent members of the same party, expressed themselves of opinion that the evidence tendered should be on oath, and the former gentleman further suggested, it being doubtful whether the Committee could sit after the House was once prorogued, that a Bill should be introduced expressly enabling it to do so. I shall have occasion subsequently to refer to this latter circumstance. As the necessity for sworn testimony in respect of such grave charges was generally obvious, an Oaths Bill was introduced into the House of Commons on the 18th of April,—was passed through the Senate on the 29th, and received the Royal Assent on the 3rd May. The time occupied in getting this measure through Parliament was pronounced unnecessarily long by many members of the Opposition.

Into the motives which induced me to sanction the Oaths Bill, and into its subsequent history, I need not enter, as the former are stated in my despatch of the 3rd of May, No. 116,) and the latter is recorded in Your Lordship's communication of June 30th, (No. 198)—but I may observe in passing, that amongst other respects in which my conduct has been criticized, the fact of my having communicated to you by the first opportunity a certified copy of the Oaths Bill has been a very general point of attack. I apprehend it will not be necessary to justify myself to Your Lordship in this particular. My law adviser had called my attention to the possibility of the Bill being illegal. Had perjured testimony been tendered under it, no proceedings could have been taken against the delinquent, and if, under these circumstances, I had wilfully withheld from the Home Government, all cognizance of the Act, it would have been a gross dereliction of duty. To those in this country who have questioned my procedure it would be sufficient to reply, that I recognise no authority on this side of the Atlantic competent to instruct the Governor General as to the nature of his correspondence with Her Majesty's Secretary of State.