

latter a slanderous calumniator; protested that his own hands were clean; and called upon his Maker to bear witness to the truth of his avowal. His conduct was not unlike that of an honest man smarting under a strong sense of injustice. He professed to court inquiry, and while he treated Mr. Huntington's motion as one of want of confidence in the Government, and triumphantly voted it down, he himself came forward with his motion for a committee. Both from his place in the House, and to the Governor-General in person, he continued to protest before God that there was no shadow of foundation for the charges made against him. He spoke of his acquittal as a matter, which did not admit of a moment's question. Under these circumstances, is it any wonder if Lord Dufferin refused to believe vague and unsubstantiated charges from such a source; charges which might well have excited incredulity by the very depth of their blackness? Is it to be wondered at, even if His Lordship sympathized with those whom he believed to have been so shamefully maligned, and who seemed so anxious to set themselves right before the country? Such was the state of affairs when Parliament was adjourned on the 23rd of May.

With regard to the prompt transmission to England of the Oaths Bill, His Excellency simply complied with his official instructions, and with the Union Act, which requires the Governor-General to transmit "by the earliest convenient opportunity" all Acts of Parliament to which he has assented on Her Majesty's behalf. His Excellency's despatch to the Imperial Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 15th August, 1873, puts this matter very clearly. It shows that he understood and was prepared to do his duty, no matter what might be said by Opposition members, and no matter how scurrilous might be the attacks of hostile newspapers. "Amongst other respects," says the despatch, "in which my conduct

has been criticised, 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 recognize 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." The assertion so often made, to the effect that the Law Officers of the Crown in England were improperly influenced to advise a disallowance of the Bill, is in itself utterly preposterous, and no attempt, so far as we know, has ever been made to bring forward any proof of it.

There remains for consideration the prorogation of Parliament on the 13th of August.

Before the adjournment on the 23rd of May, as we have seen, it had been understood that Parliament should meet only to receive the committee's report, and not for the despatch of ordinary business. It had not even been considered necessary that His Excellency should attend. During his absence in the Maritime Provinces, however, the famous McMullen correspondence had appeared in print, and this, together with other circumstances which had come to his knowledge, had made him resolve to be present at the reassembling of Parliament. The attendance of Government supporters was not large, very few, if any, being present from outlying constituencies. The Opposition on the other hand, was fully repre-