

I will read the motion of the hon. member. After detailing the facts, he moved "that a Committee of seven members be appointed to inquire into all the circumstances connected with the negotiations for the construction of the Pacific Railway, with the legislation of last session on the subject, and with the granting of the charter to Sir Hugh Allan and others." So that the aim of the hon. gentleman in making that motion was not simply to attack the Government, not simply that from improper motives or inducements of any kind they had given the charter, but was for the purpose of destroying that charter and of attacking all the legislation of the previous session on which the charter was based.

I never for one moment supposed that any hon. member would be guilty of the gross injustice of attempting to attack the whole of the legislation of the previous session and the charter solemnly granted under an Act of Parliament, and of attempting to affect vested interests on which a million of money had been staked, in the absence of the persons primarily interested. That motion was made, and was intended to be a vote of want of confidence. Was that so? Or was it not so? Will the hon. gentleman say it was not so?

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON: The motion when made was intended to express precisely what it did express. (*Laughter.*)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is said, Sir, that if there had been one honest man in the cities of Sodom or Gomorrah they might have been saved; and so the Opposition may be saved in the same way, for they have one honest man in their ranks—the member for Wentworth South (Mr. Rymal)—who stated that that motion was intended to be a vote of want of confidence. Everybody knew that that was its design (*Hear, hear*), and yet at this day, at this late hour, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Huntington) had not the manliness to get up and say so. (*Cheers.*) He dare not say it was not a motion of want of confidence. It was meant in that way, and I can prove that it was by my hon. friend the member for Wentworth South. I call him the hon. gentleman and I believe him. He said it was so. Will the hon. gentleman not believe him? Although differing from him in politics, I know he would not say what was not true. If I remember rightly, the hon. member for Shefford said he would make the motion when we went into Committee of Supply. He gave the necessary notice that is always given in such cases, and I certainly supposed that he intended to make a general motion on our policy connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said he was going to make a motion on that subject, and it was by mere accident that when my friend, the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Tilley), rose to make his Budget speech, with you in the chair, instead of a Committee of Supply, the hon. member said he would take another opportunity of making the statement in connection with the Pacific Railway. Had we gone into Committee of Supply, the hon. gentleman would have made, in the ordinary Parliamentary way, his motion of want of confidence. But, besides, if this House wants any other witness than our own common sense, which goes for something, in the next place there is evidence of the hon. member for Wentworth South, which goes for something. (*Cheers.*)

I would quote an authority which hon. gentlemen opposite don't pretend to despise, that is the authority of the *Globe*. (*Renewed cheers.*) We have also the authority of *The Mail*. *The Mail* publishes articles which we sometimes approve of, and sometimes don't approve of, but no article in all my experience that has ever appeared in the *Globe*, and no proposition made therein has been denounced. They have all been accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, what did the *Globe* correspondent of the 1st of August say? He said "Mr. Huntington's motion, of which he gave notice today, we suppose will refer to some transactions brought to light by the Americans who have been concerned in these Pacific Railway transactions from an early date. Tomorrow is looked forward to as a grand field day in the Commons. Hon. Mr. Huntington's motion is, of course, equivalent to an expression of want of confidence, and until it is disposed of no other business can be transacted." Was this motion a motion of want of confidence or not? The hon. gentleman intended it as a motion of want of confidence and there is no reason why it should not be so. The hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) founded on the same state of things his want of confidence motion.

But he should have given notice of his attack, for a more unmanly attack is unknown. What notice had been given that he was going to make that motion? True, the Government of the day are unworthy of their position unless they are ready to meet any charges brought against them. But had we the most remote information respecting that personal matter? And even when on the second day he announced that he was going to postpone to a future occasion further action he did not venture to give the slightest intimation to the men he was going to attack, the men whose characters he was going to attack of what he was going to say; but he took us by surprise and sought by bringing in documents carefully prepared to get a Committee on these statement for the purpose. Certainly it would have been so if the Committee had been granted as he proposed,—of killing, as it was designed to kill, as it was bound to kill, the efforts of the Canadian people to get a body of English capitalists, to build the Pacific Railway. (*Loud cheering.*)

He could not possibly have supposed that he would have got the inquiry through that session, but he supposed, if the House had granted the Committee on his statement, and it had gone home, telegraphed by cable by the associated press, with which some hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to have mysterious connection—(*Laughter*)—it would also certainly have affected the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, throwing back for years the building of the railway, casting discredit on Canada, and telling British Columbia what they had told them two years before, that they were not going to get the railway.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not speak in his remarks on the motion, of facts within his own knowledge, and as the member for Marquette (Mr. Cunningham) had done in his statements of facts, he only stated that he was credibly informed that the fact existed, and he would be able to prove it, and I venture to say that in the whole range of Parliamentary experience in England, and