

Mr. Macpherson. He says he met him in Kingston about the 26th of July, and he states that he told Sir George-É. Cartier that he might assure Sir Hugh Allan that the power of the Government will be exercised to secure the Presidency of the Company to him.

The hon. gentleman now says that the terms then proposed practically involved an amalgamation, but Sir Hugh Allan wanted something more. It was this, and this only, that in case an amalgamation should fail, the contract should be given to his Company. That was all the further point he wanted, whereas the position of leader of the Government was that there ought to be a new Company formed.

I need hardly tell you that the purposes of Sir Hugh Allan might be quite as well answered by the formation of a new Company as by an amalgamation. What he wanted was the control of the Company; and it would suit him just as well to control a new Company as the Canada Pacific Company; and provided he was secure in the control, his object was quite as well accomplished. But it would be inconvenient for the Government to give any positive pledge that the control should be given to that identical Company which had been set up as a Quebec Company as against an Ontario Company, therefore, in this particular, Sir Hugh Allan wanted more.

He got more, and here I come to the part in which I may fairly say the Commission has performed its work in a perfunctory manner. On the 30th of July Sir Hugh received two letters from Sir George-É. Cartier. In the longer letter it is expressly stated, "I enclose you copies of telegrams received from Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and with reference to their contents, I would say—" and et cetera. The House will observe there was more than one telegram received from Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, bearing upon this subject, which were necessary to communicate to Sir Hugh Allan as part of the authority upon which action was being taken by Sir George-É. Cartier, and yet only one has been produced, nor is any question asked of the First Minister, of Sir Hugh Allan, or of Mr. Abbott, each of whom could have told us what these telegrams were.

What are we to conjecture? Are we to say, in the face of that palpable failure on the part of the Commissioners to do their duty—in the face of that plain, palpable failure on the part of the Ministers to make a full unreserved statement of everything, are we to say that the bottom of this matter has yet been reached, when the evidence is palpably and plainly one-sided?

Let me make one observation with reference to the pitiful attempt which was made to explain two words in the shorter letter. The words of the letter were "any amount which you or your Company shall advance shall be recouped." The pitiful attempt was made by Sir Hugh Allan in his evidence to suggest certain explanations, without being able to deny what the true meaning of the words "your Company" were. The Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) who drew the original draft of that letter, who wrote the copy which was produced before the Commissioners, and the member for Argenteuil (Hon. Mr. Abbott), who is a sound lawyer

and knows the use of language and the meaning of every sentence and every word, were not asked a single question on this point. Can you doubt the reason? It was because they knew perfectly well and because they felt assured, that we would not be satisfied with this enquiry—with such child's play. But, Sir, the answer is demonstrated upon the face of the letters themselves.

These two letters were prepared at the same time by the same person, they had reference to the same transaction; a phrase is used in the one, and that identical phrase is used in the latter. (*Cheers.*) Nor is there any law of evidence better known to legal gentlemen nor better recognized by intelligent men, than that what contains the same phrase, used in different communications to different persons at the same time, with the same transaction, shows the same idea in the mind of the writer. In the letter of Sir George-É. Cartier to Sir Hugh Allan, of the 30th July, we find the words "Your Company," occur thus:—"Dear Sir Hugh, I enclose you copies of telegrams received from Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and with reference to their contents I would say that in my opinion the Governor in Council will approve of the amalgamation of your Company with the Interoceanic Company, under the name of the Canadian Pacific Railway." And then he goes on to speak of the constitution of the board, the powers of the Company, and so on.

Sir, in another letter written by Sir George on the same day, we find that identical phrase occurring, and that in reference to the money, thus:—"Dear Sir Hugh, the friends of the Government will expect to be assisted with funds in the coming elections, and any amount you or your Company shall advance for that purpose shall be recouped to you." (*Cheers.*) But of course the two Companies referred to in these two letters, written and signed at the same time, were not the same. (*Laughter.*)

I do not know what Company was meant. We are not told in the evidence what Company was meant, but it could not mean "that Company." (*Cheers and laughter.*) Why, Sir, if it were made to mean that, it would condemn the Ministry. (*Cheers.*) The whole evidence upon the subject of these two letters demonstrates that they were one transaction. (*Cheers.*) The conference took place between the member for Argenteuil (Hon. Mr. Abbott), Sir Hugh Allan, and Sir George-É. Cartier, by appointment. These very telegrams were produced. We are not told how they were produced; but they were produced, and they formed the subject of discussion. Sir Hugh Allan wanted something more definite, and Sir George-É. Cartier was willing to give him something more definite. The wily contractor understood that all this was done with the authority of the First Minister, and after discussing what the terms should be, he suggested their reduction to writing, and that the process of so reducing them should take place at a subsequent meeting, meantime that a draft should be taken, and the transaction afterwards completed.

Sir, at that first interview Sir George-É. Cartier brought up the subject of money to support the elections. Before he put his hand to the fatal bond, before he yet surrendered his liberty of action; while yet his Government and himself remained in the position in which