

and, Sir, I was surprised and grieved to find the Government opposing and defeating it. Their reasons for so doing I then only suspected, but as seen by the light of after days, are now manifest and clear, for the First Minister of the Crown, with that sagacity, foresight, and tact for which he is remarkable, foresaw even then that it was necessary to the existence of his party and to his own retention of power that the Bill should not become law; and some of the fruits of that action may now be seen in the printed evidence before us, showing what lavish expenditure of money was employed in controlling the elections, and also in the fact that more than 50 election petitions were presented to you, Sir, upon the opening of Parliament, more than twenty of which are yet undecided, and may drag their slow length along for sessions yet to come, allowing them to sit here and vote.

I will not say on which side of you, Mr. Speaker; that is well known; those who, if the petitions against their return had been tried before the proper tribunal would not now, I believe, occupy seats in this House. Sir, as the events of that memorable session are now matters of history, and well known to the House and to the country. I shall only briefly allude to a few of the most important.

On the 2nd day of April, an hon. gentleman rose in his place in this House, and preferred charges against the Government of such a serious and startling nature that many refused to credit them, and I must confess that I thought the hon. gentleman had been misinformed, and that the evidence on which he relied would be disproved, and when an investigation was demanded, and without comment or discussion, a vote about to be taken thereon, which I am free to admit, I looked upon as vote of want of confidence, with doubt unremoved, and loyal to the promise to which I have referred, I voted with the Government; but a short time then elapsed, when I heard the First Minister in his place declare those charges were unfounded and utterly untrue and on his motion a Committee was appointed to report thereon.

Sir, I saw the action of this Committee delayed and hindered by a most wonderful combination of circumstances, brought about, as I now believe, by the accused Ministers, who, denying their guilt did not hasten to prove their innocence. Parliament was adjourned to the 13th day of August, a day henceforth memorable, then to receive the report of the Committee. The day arrived, a majority of the members of this House assembled, when the Ministry, trampling upon its rights and privileges, advised His Excellency to prorogue it. This, with haste, was done ere its Committee could be heard or any action taken, with a Parliament ejected from its Chambers, its Committee strangled, its rights ignored, and its powers defied. The accused Ministry then proceeded to appoint their judges, and constituted a court to try themselves.

By the glimmering of truth evoked from this tribunal, and by the light obtained from that remarkable series of letters which had in the meantime appeared in the public press, signed by Sir Hugh Allan, and by his own affidavit admitted to be substantially correct; we have presented to us the wondrous, the humiliating spectacle, unparalleled in the history of any country where British laws and institutions prevail, of one man who, by the power of his wealth, his

instinctive knowledge of men and their value, his remarkable genius and skill in comprehending the situation, and knowing where and when to apply the powerful leverage of his almighty dollars, actually through a purchased and paid Executive, controlling the interests and affairs of this great Dominion. I saw this man, a contractor with the Government, who, as he said, looked upon the two political parties as factions, who had never been known to contribute but a trifle towards election contests, and who, in his long career, had never even voted but once before, now eager and anxious to add to his already overflowing wealth by obtaining this great contract, with its \$30,000,000 of money and 50,000,000 of acres of land; and, ambitious to connect his name with the greatest enterprise of the age, and to be known to posterity as the master spirit that controlled it, acknowledging on his oath that he had expended for the purpose of obtaining these ends, and on behalf of Ministers and their supporters, no less a sum than \$350,000, out of which the First Minister of the Crown confessed to have received, with two of his colleagues, \$162,000, and for what purpose? To control and influence the elections in their behalf, and to demoralize and corrupt the people.

But, Sir, before advancing that large sum, Sir Hugh, with that shrewdness and business tact characteristic of the man, demanded and obtained the promise of the charter and the presidency of the Company formed to construct the road, thus virtually controlling it, and when the money had been paid the promise was fulfilled. Sir, what conclusion, what verdict can be arrived at from all this but that Ministers have been guilty of a grave offence and misdemeanour, and are no longer worthy to occupy their high positions? Sir, I think I shall not be accused of hypocrisy or affectation when I say that, as a Canadian by birth, as a lover of my country, proud of her position and her prospects, sanguine as to the great future in store for her, jealous of her honour and her fame, and of the reputation and standing of her public men; I feel grieved and humiliated to render such a verdict, and,

Sad as angels for the good man's sin,

Weep to record and blush to give it in.

Sir, at the risk of wearying the House, I would refer to several of the reasons, or so-called arguments, generally advanced by the friends of the Government to palliate or excuse their conduct. The one generally first referred to is that the Opposition party have used money in their elections for corrupt purposes, and for equally guilty acts; and, therefore, Ministers should not be condemned. Sir, this charge against the Opposition had not been proved. When it is I shall be just as ready to condemn and punish them. At all events, it has not been charged that they sold a great public trust to obtain their money. This reason might as well apply to some prisoner in the dock who, charged with a serious crime, confesses his guilt but claims free pardon and exemption from punishment because, forsooth, as he states, some other person has committed a similar offence.

Another reason advanced is that a Government which has inaugurated and is now carrying to completion so many great public