

not of necessity a motion of want of confidence. A charge is made; a charge of such gravity as to demand an investigation, and the proposal to have an investigation cannot be a proposal that there is no confidence in the Administration. I quite admit that the Administration can make it a motion of want of confidence, but the motion itself, as projected by the mover, cannot be considered one of want of confidence.

Then the attitude of the member for Shefford in making the motion, indicated it was not one of want of confidence. He made no speech; he made no attack upon the Ministry; he simply made his statement and the charge based upon it. Then the attitude of Ministers themselves stamps their argument out, because they themselves made a similar motion a few days later.

Next the hon. gentleman alleged that no pressure was put upon him to grant the Committee. Well, of course we accept unreservedly the statement of the hon. gentleman, but it is established by the evidence brought forward last night in this House, that several supporters of the Government considered the charges were a proper subject of investigation, and they informed the members of the Government that was the last vote they would receive from them unless the Committee was granted. By what intuition the hon. gentleman became possessed of this fact it boasts not to consider; suffice it to say that pressure was put upon the Government, and that the Government yielded to the pressure.

Then the hon. gentleman stated that he never dreamed that the Committee would proceed at once. I ask every candid man in this House, except the hon. gentleman, whether he ever dreamed of anything else, whether the whole tone of the discussion, the conduct of the various proceedings which ensued subsequent to the appointment of the Committee, did not all point conclusively to the commencing at once, and prolonging the labours of the Committee beyond the session only in case it should be found impossible to finish those labours during the session?

The hon. gentleman was bound, if he thought that this Committee would not meet to do business till after the return of these gentlemen, to have said at once that the Committee could do nothing until their return. He was bound to have taken the House into his confidence in this matter, but there were many matters with reference to which the hon. gentleman kept his supporters in the dark. All that time he had in his desk these damning papers—that contract between Sir Hugh Allan and his American associates—papers which have disgraced the writer of them irredeemably throughout the world. And yet the hon. gentleman never took his supporters into his confidence in this matter, and I venture to say it was a surprise and a shock to many of them when they found that before this charter was granted, while nothing had been done that could not be undone, the hon. gentleman had become acquainted with the villainy that had been perpetrated by the man whom he afterwards placed in the position of President of the Company. (*Loud cheers.*)

It was the duty of the hon. gentleman to have told the House, which he was swaying with an iron rod, whither he was leading

them, and that this Committee could not meet till these gentlemen returned. But I shall prove by facts beyond dispute that, whatever the hon. gentleman's secret intention was, his public and avowed plan of action was that the Committee should proceed. The hon. gentleman has told us that he knew the chances were infinitesimally small that these gentlemen would return during the session, and yet the hon. gentleman agreed to have the Oaths Bill pushed through the House, and he brought down His Excellency in the middle of the session to assent to that Bill. To what end did he do that unusual thing, if the Oaths Bill was not to be used immediately afterwards? (*Hear, hear.*) It is clear that, whatever may have been the hon. gentleman's secret thoughts, he was willing to lead this House to believe that immediate action on the part of the Committee was desired and intended by him. (*Hear, hear.*)

But when the Committee met, the hon. gentleman applied for an adjournment, which the Committee agreed to. That proposition was subjected to the House, and then for the first time he delivered a speech in vindication of his conduct in which he declared there was not one jot or tittle of proof of these charges. He made a speech, in which I am sure he led every man on both sides of this House to believe that either he must have been clearly and utterly false, or my hon. friend for Shefford (Hon. Mr. Huntington) must have been utterly mistaken in bringing forward this charge. No shadow of foundation for it; nothing whatever which could have led to the preferring of such charges. These were the declarations of innocence on the part of the hon. gentleman.

Under these circumstances, and by virtue of that denial (how candid it was, he having all the papers in his desk at the time, you may judge), he induced the House to postpone the Committee. The Committee was to meet on the 2nd of July. It so happened that I was not in the House during any of the discussions upon the subject of the Oaths Bill. I was present when the Committee was moved for, when the hon. gentleman made the statement that the evidence should be taken under oath, for he it was who first made the suggestion to take the evidence on oath. I thought it strange that he should ask that Committee to sit after prorogation without asking for a Bill to authorize that procedure, and I thought also that if he desired to take evidence on that, he should introduce a Bill for that purpose.

I have argued this question before, and I argue it to-day upon other and higher grounds than the question whether the Oaths Bill was *intra* or *extra vires*. That is of no consequence, because if we have not yet the power we can easily get that power, but the question of disallowance is one of the most serious questions that can be brought before this Parliament. The views of the First Minister upon this question of disallowance have been made public. On the 8th of June, 1868, in a memorandum submitted to His Excellency, the first Minister used these words:—"Of late years Her Majesty's Government has not as a general rule interfered with the legislation of the colonies, their representative institutions, and responsible Government, except in the cases specially mentioned in the instructions to the Governor as in matters of Imperial and not merely local interest."