objection was not merely with regard to the criminal law of the land, not having process of outlawry in it, but that so far as this particular case was concerned, in the Province of Manitoba, whatever it might be elsewhere, the process of outlawry did not exist, and that the proceedings in outlawry upon an indictment for felony could not be had in the manner required by the law of England. He would endeavour to explain to the House the ground upon which he had taken that view. No one for a single moment would imagine that he (Mr. CAMERON) had the least desire that RIEL should remain a member of this House, because if he was not to vacate his seat he (Mr. CAMERON) would be prepared to move that he be expelled. The position that should be taken with regard to constitutional forms and rights was one that should not be given up if they had strong convictions on the subject. He (Mr. CAMERON) had very strong convictions on this point, and felt bound to offer for the consideration of the House the grounds which had influenced his mind in saying that upon the face of the records of this proceeding there was no valid judgment of outlawry. Those who were versed in the law were aware that certain proceedings must be taken in reference to outlawry in England. They go back to a very remote period, except recently, when a change was made in civil procedure by what was called the "Common Law Procedure Act." They dated back prior to the existence of Canada as a colony. From the times of HENRY VI. down to the last act passed in the reign of WILLIAM and MARY. They explained the manner in which proceedings were to be taken in criminal and civil cases tending to outlawry. While in common law proceedings for initiating outlawry might be taken upon an indictment, for criminal proceedings the manner in which these proceedings were afterwards carried on, and the ceremony to be observed in respect to them were pointed out. Now, when they had before them a record of judgment, and there was either in the law with regard to it, or on the face of the judgment itself, that which invalidated it, he thought they were not precluded from declaring that it was not a record of outlawry. They were not in the least degree precluded, as they would be in dealing with a question of fact, from examining the record. They could not be prevented any more than a court could, from declaring from the face of that record that there was no outlawry, and that the House could not, therefore, take proceedings upon it. Now, in the proceedings to be taken in outlawry, though to most persons they might appear to be merely technical, involved rights and privileges, and an explanation of them, therefore, might be interesting to most of the hon. gentlemen present. Upon an indictment for a felony punishable with death, if the accused does not appear, a writ called a bench warrant is issued at the time of the Assizes, which is the same as a writ which is called *capias ad respondendum*. That writ requires to be issued once, twice and three times in some cases and once or twice in other cases. The sheriff of the county where the party dwells or of the county next to it is required to return the writ, declaring the party is not forthcoming, and for each writ a similar return is made. He is required to make proclamations at the seat of the County Court for five different times, and a writ was required to be issued called a writ of *exigent*. That writ and the proclamation bear the same date of issue and the same date of return. The time which must by law elapse between each of these proclamations is a month. The last day—the *quinto exactus*—when the proclamation of declaration expires, is the day on which the party is required to appear, so that, in fact, the outlawry shall not take place until the day in which the party has been required to appear shall have passed. So much was this the case in England, where this system had been in use for so long a period of years, that if there happened not to be a coroner in a county, there could be no judgment of outlawry pronounced. The law was plain upon that point, and the authorities distinct. If there were no sheriff in the county for over a year, proceedings could not be taken until a new sheriff was appointed, and so long as there was no coroner in the county, no sentence of outlawry could be pronounced. The proceedings to which he had referred had every one of them to be taken in the order in which he had referred to them, and if that order were departed from in the slightest degree, the record might be treated as null and void.