

"and that to allow the House to proceed to business in their absence would be a gross impropriety to which you would not consent, and that in view of this circumstance as my constitutional advisers, placed about me by the will of Parliament, you unanimously advise me to prorogue. Well gentlemen, when Parliament last voted, you possessed a commanding majority: whether you have lost the confidence of Parliament or not I cannot tell. You say you have not. Others say you have. Your political opponents have brought grave accusations against you. You are therefore under a ban. You have forfeited my confidence. I do not intend to take your advice, except on mere questions of administration but—Pray retain your places." To which, of course, these gentlemen would have replied:—"We are highly sensible of Your Excellency's forbearance, perhaps you will favor us with a list of subjects on which you will accept our recommendation, as well as an *index expurgatorius* of those which are tabooed. The arrangement will lighten our responsibilities, our salaries will remain the same, and our honour"—I cannot exactly conjecture how the sentence would have concluded. But the suggestion that my refusal to take their advice on prorogation would not have been tantamount to a dismissal of them, is too untenable to need refutation.

Before, however, closing this head of the discussion it may be well to examine the grounds on which it is alleged, I ought to have withdrawn my confidence from Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues.

In order to answer this question, we must inquire what I had to go upon? There were Mr. *Huntington's* statements as displayed in his motion,—but these statements were not statements of facts, but of conclusions drawn from facts within Mr. *Huntington's* knowledge perhaps, but not within mine, and offered no safe foothold. Next there were Sir *Hugh Allan's* statements,—but upon which was I to found myself,—upon those in Sir *Hugh's* letters, in which he admits there was a good deal of "inaccurate" language, or upon those in his affidavit. If upon the latter, could I have pronounced the Government guilty? Then there were Mr. *McMullen's* statements,—but these have been much questioned, and many of them have been contradicted. I do not think the people of Canada would be willing to allow the reputation of any of their representative men to be staked upon evidence of this nature. Lastly, there were Sir *George Cartier's* letter, and Sir *John Macdonald's* telegram. In respect to these documents, I would merely observe that suspicious as they might appear, no man would have been justified in acting upon any conclusion in regard to them, until it had been shown with what transactions they were connected. There is as yet no evidence to prove that the sums referred to were consideration moneys for the Pacific Railway charter; and Sir *Hugh Allan* states upon his oath that they were not, as will be seen from the subjoined extract from his affidavit:—

"In these and similar ways I expended sums of money approaching in amount those mentioned in those letters, as I conceive I had a perfect right to do; but I did not state in those letters, nor is it the fact, that any portion of those sums of money were paid to the Members of the Government, or were received by them or on their behalf directly as a consideration in any form for any advantage to me in connection with the Pacific Railway contract."

On the other hand, what were the countervailing facts within my knowledge. The theory of the prosecution "is that the terms of the charter were corruptly modified to the advantage of Sir *Hugh Allan* and his American confederates." Has the bargain been carried out? Certainly not as far as the Americans are concerned. Their complaint is that they have taken nothing by their motion. I was myself a witness of the pains taken to exclude them when the charter was being framed. Have Sir *Hugh Allan* and his friends been gratified with that control over the concern to attain which Mr. *McMullen* asserts he bribed my Ministers? This is a fact less easy to elucidate, but I myself believe that he has not. At moments when Sir *John Macdonald* could not have been playing a part he gave me repeated indications of his desire to prevent Sir *Hugh* from obtaining any commanding influence on the direction. That direction was framed with a view to a proper representation upon it of every Province in Canada, regard being had to the wealth and pop-