of wite, show-English (1869)to the A. Aot. sh House uire and provision nation of Iouse of the 21at

ny years ommons. Parliammittee itestible, ties nor 1 on the a, by its er oaths wer can Report. his eviith the given." d been 0 1857. mittee: of the ig that les on o have i, I beain the oath by magianesses. an inbe on ouse of th in for his 1 oath out a

1871, dmin"ister an oath to witnesses examined at the scheme deserve the thanks of the "the bar of the said House," and " any "Committee of the House of Commons " may administer an oath to the witnesses "examined before such Committee."-Vic. 34-5 o. 83.

THE negotiations between the Government and the various parties mentioned in the evidence given before the Royal Commissioners are perhaps the best answers that could be given to Mr. HUNTINGTON'S charges.

Sir FRANCI' goes further back than any other, and we give the first part of his evidence in his own words.

1. "The first person with whom I had "any conversation on the subject was Mr. " CYRILLE GRAHAM, Commissioner of the "Hudson's Bay Company, in 1870 and "1871. He told me he had been in com-" munication with influential gentlemenin "the United States, and he thought ar-"rangements might be made by which "great economy could be produced in the " construction of the Railway, that the " Americans, he believed, would abandon "the western part of their line and carry "it through Canadian territory, if the " Canadians would abandon their eastern " section and carry it through American " territory [from Sault Ste. Marie to Red "River]. In May, 1871, Sir JOHN ROSE "sent me a copy of a letter he hadsent to " Sir JOHN MACDONALD, in which he in-" formed me that persons had spoken to "him [in London] in very much the same " terms as Mr. GRAHAM."

Sir FRANCIS' statements show that, from the first, the promoters of the American Pacific Railway left nothing undone to get possession of the Canadian Pacific. They laid their plans with great skill, bringing their suggestions to the Canadian Government from every possible point, from England, and from the United States, and they pursued their purpose with a persistency which shows their appreciation of the great game they were playing. Some, who ought to have known better, fell into the trap, and those who thwarted

country.

2. Early in July, 1871, Mr. SMITH and Mr. MCMULLEN, of Chicago, with KERSTE-Messrs. WADDINGTON and MAN, and Mr. JAMES BEATY, Jr., as their Solicitor, came to Ottawa, an interview and asked with the Government. Sir JOHN and Sir FRANCIS the only members were of the Government in Ottawa at the time. As a matter of courtesy, they were received, but told distinctly that it was not in the power of the Government to enter into any negotiations. They brought a document signed by soven or eight wellknown capitalists in the United States.

3. Sir FRANOIS HINCKS, in August, 1871, gave to Sir HUGH ALLAN the names of the American capitalists mentioned above. The suggestion of Sir HUGH's name had come from Mr. MCMULone of his friends, LEN or some "and," says Sir FRANCIS, " as I "had been the means of their open-" ing communication with him, I thought "it only fair to give him the list of "names" [signed to the document just Sir Hugh soon after saw named]. Sir JOHN while passing through Montreal, but told Sir FRANCIS that he had a discouraging reply from Sir JOHN.

4. In October (1871) Sir HUGH, with the gentlemen just named, went to Ottawa to make another proposal to the Government. At that time there were several members of the Government present. The names of the American capitalists were again produced on their interview with the Ministry. Sir JOHN asked Sir HUGH if he had a proposition to make. Sir. HUGH said, "if I make a pro-" position are you prepared to consider any " scheme proposed ?" SirJOHN replied that they were not, that they must first obtain the authority of Parliament before they could do it. "Then," said Sir HUGH, "I am not " prepared to make any proposition," and they left.

Sir FRANCIS says "that in his un-