

Here we have a document from that Chamber impeaching some members of Government, and this House, by delay, would be regarded as striving to shelter the accused from the investigation. I do not think it is to our interest to lie under such a suspicion. The object of the bill is very plain; it is to empower committees of both Houses to administer oaths to witnesses that may be brought before them. Witnesses have been summoned to appear on Wednesday, and the result of our delay will be to prevent their being sworn. Was this our object? In England the House of Commons and Lords have agreed that all committees before whom inquiries affecting the conduct of Ministers are to be made, shall have the power of administering oaths. Is it because this is the English practice, or to shelter anybody, that we should proceed differently? The advanced period of the session and the pressure of business, are further reasons against procrastination, and although we have our share and sphere in legislation, we must to a certain extent regard the wishes and temper of the other House. It would be a reflection on this House to delay action at present. I can show from authorities what took place in the House of Lords when a bill of the same kind was submitted there.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Let us see it on Monday.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—I can show it immediately if you desire to postpone the motion.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I have nothing to say to it. The order of the House is for Monday.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—We dispense, in one case, for a day, with the rules of the House, and should dispense with them in a case warranted by the feeling of the country. The present charge is a real impeachment of the members of the Government.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—That is a reason why we should proceed cautiously.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—The only thing to be gained by this is delay. The Commons Committee will meet and have no power to administer oaths to witnesses. By delay we shall go contrary to the unanimous vote of the House of Commons, representing the people. We have precedents to cite. In 1867 we passed a law empowering certain committees of both Houses to administer oaths.

Hon. Mr. CARRALL said the arguments in favor of indecent haste were not sufficiently potent to compel him to vote to set aside the orders of the day. This body

was supposed to be calm, dignified, and eminently respectable, and for aught he knew it was. (Laughter.) It was on no occasion required to be impetuous, or to exercise unbecoming haste, but to act with due deliberation. If the fate of the Government hung in the balance, on this question, let it hang a few hours longer. (Laughter.) Although he always paid great attention to the arguments of his hon. friend from Grandville, (Mr. Letellier), yet he could not perceive in his remarks anything but vague mutterings of distant thunder—threats of something dreadful to come—he saw no reason for anything but the ordinary course in reference to this bill.

Hon. Mr. SMITH—Is it intended to pay these witnesses?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I really do not know. I did not see the bill till I came to the table this moment. The House of Commons doubtless will pay them, as they always do. They will not be paid by the Government.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—So we are to understand that the Government now oppose taking this bill into consideration?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I do not propose to interfere with the present order of the House.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—That is a little more delay. Let the people take it for what it is worth.

The motion as to the adjournment was carried.

#### EXTRADITION, &c.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL introduced a Bill respecting extradition. The present law provides for the extradition of criminals asked for by the United States. This new measure is to deal similarly with other countries. First reading carried.

#### THIRD READING.

The Central Prison Ontario Bill.—Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL.

#### GRAND TRUNK BILL.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON said the Hon. Mr. Ferrier, now absent, requested him to move the second reading of the Grand Trunk Arrangements Bill, 1873. He explained its substance—to authorise the company to expend two millions sterling in improving the road—that money to be raised in form of stock.—Carried. Bill referred to Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways.

On motion of Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL the House then adjourned.