

ough a cross-ex- told him he would not get the contract. It tions, and if an enquiry was demanded, he be- member for Bruce. He ridiculed

that such a sum as, say at most, \$90,000, was sufficient to corrupt the 83 counties of Ontario pursued by him, there had been professions of great personal attachment to self; he hoped that these professions were

no; only a thousand dollars each. He then took up the charges *again*. There was not

one particle of testimony to prove the first charge. He, however, did not anticipate being

able to carry conviction to those who, for months past, had made up their minds that the accused was guilty. But it was not to these he appealed, but to the country. What would some of them say if they knew that let-

He continued that he thought Sir Hugh must have been brought up somewhere in the vicinity of

A GRIT CAMP.

Were the correspondence published submitted by the Government, it was bound to do so, so far as the Government were concerned, were paraded to the country, but were not confirmed by Sir H. Allan's testimony? He contended that he thought Sir Hugh must have been brought up somewhere in the vicinity of

WOMEN AND INTERLUDE
UNO, TWO, THREE AND FOUR

ted in the first instance to Sir John Macdonald, which was not proven, he submitted that there would be no evidence to convict the Government. What was the condition of affairs up to the 26th July, 1872? Sir H. Allan had

broken with the Americans, as the Government had said the country would not permit it. Sir McDonald read a number of letters, and said that Sir Hugh Allan had written, in December, 1871, Sir Hugh Allan and Mr. McMillen had entered into an agreement in anticipation of the approaching session. What was the agreement? Sir Hugh Allan to make such an agreement as would be to the advantage of the House, or would refer to the House written or he would refer to the House the same as the favor of the House, to whom its institution was repugnant. Then, it was feeling of the House that a tribunal as such would be a detriment to the House, and a side without endangering the liberties and property of the Dominion. Prior to the adjournment of the House in May, it was stated that on the 13th of August the House would be asked to consider the proposed agreement, which would be referred to the House.

statement of the gentlemen who had gone before the Commission and given their evidence where they could be cross-examined. These gentlemen had the confidence of nine-tenths of the community, and there

There was no man, who had not lost all sense of honor, who would not believe every word they said. When the hon. member had refused to go before the Commission and examine his witnesses, how could he have the audacity to ask the House to take the unsworn testimony of a man like Mr. McMullen, or a man like Norris, and to believe that they were telling the truth? The Commission would not refuse to take the evidence and keep out the members, he believed. In the first instance, it was not the intention of the Commission, if a report had been presented, stating that the information furnished by the House would not have been conclusive, to look at the converse,—would it be pretended that if the Ministers had been guilty they would have desired to retain their position for a year, and send the members home?

Commissioners' work was accomplished? Sir Hugh Allan would not perjure himself, and surely the gentlemen who had spoken so highly of the character and standing of Sir Hugh Allan, would not say that he had committed

perjury—when his evidence came in the way of their vengeance and of their malice. Surely they would not, in the face of the statement of Sir Hugh Allan, who, with his Bible in his hand, swore Sir John Macdonald was as

INNOCENT & LAURE,
accept the unworn statement to the contrary of McMullen. What was there in the second question asked by the Government? Was there anything wrong in the charge that the Hon. Hugh Allan had entered into an agreement with the Americans? What had the Government to do with this? Was there anything to withdraw from them the confidence of the business to attend to, such as with reference to the Oaths Bill. The Ministers should not have taken such steps as would have prevented the doing of the 19th of August. It was not the Ministers' fault that they were charged, but the great majority of members of the House lay under the accusation of having taken money, and therefore there was the necessity for immediate enquiry, as was indicated by

country? As to the first charge, it had not been proved that the Government knew of any agreement with the Americans, and did not know of any letter passing between them, as had been said by Sir Hugh Allan. In support of this he further noted the Black-

Beatty correspondence there was not a particle of evidence to prove that the Americans had advanced any money to obtain the contract. What were the facts at the time of the alleged payment of American money? Sir

John A. Macdonald and several companies before him applying for the charter; furthermore, the only agreement made with Sir Frank Allen was as to the formation of the amalgamated company, long after the money was contributed. Sir Huxh Allen never got to know them to clear themselves from charges which to some extent reflected themselves. From the Governor's message saw a letter from the member for the sand county of St. John, announcing that would not be present, and, therefore,

The House then took recess.

turn for the electoral district of Provencher; Manitoba, announcing the election of Mr. Louis Riel, in place of the late Sir G. E. Cartier.

DEBATE RESUMED.

Hon. James McDonald resuming the debate on Mr. McKenzie's motion, said that the only evidence upon which the Opposition based their charges was the statements of irresponsible persons, and unfair inferences from facts

which had been completely done away with before the Commission of Enquiry. The agreement with Sir Hugh Allan and the Americans was never known to the Administration. The evidence showed that in an interview with Sir Hugh Allan, according to that gentleman's

statement, the Government was not in a position to enter into an agreement with Sir Hugh and the Americans. Who was the witness to contradict this statement? His letter confirmed the statement that he

(Sir Hugh) had entered into an agreement with the Americans, but without the privy of the Government. He urged that if the Government had made a contract with him and then swindled him, Sir Hugh Allen would naturally have taken these proceedings to his own help. It also was unanimously decided at Montserrat that it would be

HIGHLY INDECOROUS

for their functions to be interfered with by

rough Allan would naturally have been the first to expose them. But here he voluntarily came forward to defend them. If one letter of Sir Hugh Allan's was able to convict, another was able to acquit. Now, on the 24th of October, long after the elections and pay-

ment of the money, S. Hugh, without the solicitation of the Government, and without the knowledge of the Government, wrote to Mr. McMullen." No action has yet been taken, so far as I know, by the Government

the matter of the Rhine Railway." Thus no action had been taken, though it was alleged Sir Hugh Allan had bought the Government body and soul. He wrote further that the Government was inclined to exact a declaration that no foreigners should

directly or indirectly have any share in the road. He deprecated the style of reasoning adopted by the Opposition, for no English jury would convict a lad for stealing a handkerchief on mere inferences such as

those raised by the Opposition. He declared that the \$162,000 was a contribution from Sir Hugh, and unless it were proved that he had a corrupt motive, it was nothing more or less than an impertinence to ask why Sir Hugh Allan contributed so large a sum of money.

The answer given on this point by Sir Hugh must be taken as truthful, unless he were proved guilty of perjury; and the explanation he gave of the contribution was that he wished to support the Government, whose policy

he approved. He professed himself as perfectly willing to lay the whole facts of the case before the people, and he was confident the Government would obtain a triumphant acquittal; and that condign punishment would

know the men who had the hardihood to vote for the resolution moved by the leader of the Opposition. He briefly defended the prorogation of the House in August, and denounced the conduct of Mr. Huntington in writing to the Governor-General enclosing copies of the

documents connected with the Pacific charges. The leader of the Opposition had no authority for making the statement that he was supported by a majority of the House; but on the contrary, he knew the leader of

The Government would be supported. If the Opposition, by a catch vote, threw higher gentleman from power, the country would erode to him justice, and people would keep sacred watch over his honor, an inheritance of which they might well be proud.

concluded by moving an amendment to the amendment, that "after considering the statement made in evidence before us, and while we regret the outlay of money by all political parties, and de-

For more stringent measures to put an end to such practice, we at the same time beg to continue our confidence in His Excellency's advisers, and their administration of public affairs."

Mr. Glass said, that in consequence of the

