

**Mr. MILLS:** By the Bill of Rights it was expressly provided that a member could be questioned or be brought to task for no word uttered in Parliament, except by the High Court of Parliament itself, and the issue of the Commission to do so was unconstitutional and without precedent.

With regard to the express wording of the amendment of the hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie), the number of acts separate and distinct in themselves which constituted the policy of the Administration for the past few years, pointed to the conclusion that they were guilty of taking money for the purpose of carrying the elections. From the time this Commission began its enquiry up to the day Mr. Campbell was examined, the witnesses called all knew nothing, and the whole enquiry appeared from the beginning to be prosecuted with the intention of proving by implication that all the charges were untrue.

The tone of the Ministerial journals from the first was in the same direction, from the day that Mr. McMullen's letters were published; but the day that Mr. Campbell appeared before the Commission the tactics were changed, and he could think of no other reason for this than that the Government had, by this time, come to the conclusion that unless some face were put upon it, they would undoubtedly have to submit to a Parliamentary enquiry, and they, therefore, had better admit a certain portion of the charges, as much as they thought it would be safe for them to do—more, as it would appear, that they were quite safe in doing.

But there were other things in this report which it was well that the attention of the House should be called to. There were discrepancies between the reports appearing in the newspapers and the report contained in the blue book of the evidence adduced before the Commission. The questions were not the same as those appearing in the newspapers. Important statements which appeared in the public journals were omitted, and the answers to many of the questions were considerably changed. Sometimes the formation of both questions and answers were so much changed as to give an entirely different meaning to the evidence. Why was this so? He did not know. It might be said that the newspaper reports were not correct, but, as a rule, when two independent authorities accorded in a matter of this kind, as was the case with two leading journals on this point, it was pretty good proof of their correctness.

He referred to the evidence of Sheriff Leblanc, of Montreal, in proof of the assertion that Sir George-É. Cartier knew when he was dealing with Sir Hugh Allan that he was dealing with the American Company. Then they had the sworn testimony of Sir Hugh that he obtained the charter for a certain monetary consideration, and the compact, so far as Sir George was concerned, was not withdrawn. Apart from there being any contract, it was a highly improper proceeding for the Government to accept money from Sir Hugh. He considered that there was evidence of a bargain. How came it that when they were discussing the question of the charter that \$25,000 were promised to aid in the elections?

He considered there was sufficient evidence of an improper understanding having existed between the Government and Sir

Hugh, and he had not confidence in the policy the Government had pursued, and for these reasons he would support the amendment of his hon. friend the member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie). The manner in which the matter had been conducted also led him to the conclusion that it would be improper for him to support the First Minister of the Crown. (*Cheers.*)

**Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD** [then rose and was received with deafening cheers, which lasted for some minutes]: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to address you on the two motions now before the House, and the reason why I did not so intend is that I had already given my testimony on oath, and in that testimony I had endeavoured, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, to state the whole case as far as I knew it, according to the best of my conscience, concealing nothing and revealing everything. Therefore, I did not think it well, according to the ordinary rule, that I should attempt in any way to supplement my statement on oath by my statements not on oath. (*Cheers.*)

However I have been taunted, not in the House certainly, but I have heard it elsewhere and have seen it in the papers that I have been withholding my statements; that I have been keeping back, and that I dare not meet the House and the country.

Sir, I dare meet this House and the country. (*Cheers.*) I know too well what the House and the country will do, and what the feeling of the country will be, when they know all the facts. They know many of them now, and those they do not know I shall endeavour presently to enter upon.

But now I enter upon the subject which is most interesting to this House—the question whether the Government or any members of the Government were in any way implicated in the giving or granting of a charter, or of a privilege of any kind to men for corrupt motives. I shall allude to one or two subjects which a short time ago assumed prominence in the opinion of the country, but which in the course of the present debate have almost sunk into insignificance.

A short time ago, from the 13th August till now, we heard nothing else but the unconstitutionality of the prorogation; nothing else but that a great wrong had been committed on the privileges of the House. Although I was here for only a few minutes before the House was prorogued, if I remember aright, this Chamber rung with charges that the privileges of the House had been invaded. I not only heard the voice of the hon. member for Châteauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton), but I saw his hand brought down, with the ponderous strength of the hon. gentleman, on his desk, when he called “Privilege!” and all because the representative of the Sovereign had exercised a prerogative conferred upon him by law. The hon. gentleman was committing an anachronism.

There were days when the prerogative of the Crown and the privileges of the people were in opposition. There were days—but they were days long gone by, and there was no necessity for any attempt to revive them now—days when the prerogative of the