"the Canadian Parliament, you desire to renew to him, as Chairman of the Committee, "the offer made by you on the part of the Government to issue a Royal Commission, addressed to the gentlemen forming the Committee, which would confer upon them all the "power given to the Committee by the House of Commons, including the examination of "the witnesses by the Committee; but, as I understand your proposal, it is that the Government should give to the several Members of the Committee named by the House of "Commons to enquire into the charge made against it, a Commission to enquire into the "same charges, with power to examine witnesses under oath, and this with a view to "carry out the intention of the House, to have this enquiry made under oath. Now I "would beg to call to your attention that the Committee was originally named on your "own motion, as an ordinary Parliamentary Committee, without reference to any authority to examine witnesses under oath, and that it was only on the suggestion of the "Committee subsequently made, that the House and Senate unanimously passed the Oaths "Bill, although on more than one occasion you yourself made the suggestion, unheeded by "the House, that a Commission might be issued instead of passing an Act to authorize the "administering of oaths to the witnesses. This alone seems to me to be conclusive that the "House of Commons, whose nominee I am on the Committee, did not intend that the enquiry should be carried on by a Commission appointed by the Executive, and responsible "as such only to that Executive. It seems to me, moreover, that the authority which is "sought to be conferred on the Committee to examine witnesses under oath cannot be "attained by the issue of a Royal Commission, for,although the Commissioners appointed "might examine witnesses under oath, it would not be as Members of the Committee appointed by the House that they would do so, but as Commissioners, whose decisions and "proceedings would be subject to the supervision and control of the Executive, under "whom they would hold their appointment, and not of the House. I have always been "willing, as a Member of the House of Commons, to obey its commands in reference to any "Parliamentary duties it might impose upon me; in that view I did not shirk the arduous "and unenviable position of a member of this Committee of Enquiry, as being part of the "labour and duty to which a member of Parliament is bound to submit; but if, instead of "moving for the appointment of a Committee by the House, the Government had proposed to name me on a Commission for the purpose of this enquiry, I would then certainly have declined the proposed Commission. I cannot see why I should now accept it, "when it seems to me that the effect of issuing such a Commission would be to supersede "the Committee, and more especially in view of the declaration you made immediately "before the adjournment of the Session in reference to Mr. *Blake* and myself, that we "should not have consented to serve on the Committee, that men in our positions in England would not have done so, and that you could not expect any fair play at our hands. "This alone should be a sufficient reason why I humbly believe I should not be called "upon to accept a Commission from the Government of which you are the head, after "your public declaration, made in my absence, of my unfitness to perform what the Commission would impose on me.

"I have the honour, &c.,
(Signed) "A. A. DORION."

"MONTREAL, July 3.

"SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd "inst., enclosing a copy of a letter addressed by you to the Hon. Mr. *Cameron*, as "Chairman of the Pacific Railway Enquiry Committee. I cannot agree in your "statement that the acceptance of a Royal Commission would enable the Committee to "proceed with the enquiry and the examination of witnesses on oath. The Committee is, "I believe, unanimously of opinion that the acceptance of the Commission would not "enable the Committee to make progress, and that the action of the Commissioners