

Commission should in all respects be the same as the Committee, with the power to take evidence on oath superadded. At this meeting M. DORION moved that Sir FRANCIS HINCKS be examined, but Mr. JAMES MACDONALD, after asking to have their instructions read which were, "*that the witnesses be examined on oath,*" moved in amendment that as the Oaths Bill has been disallowed "and this Committee was instructed to examine witnesses under oath, *Resolved, that they cannot be examined until further instructed by the House—as witnesses cannot be examined before the Committee without being sworn,*" and on this the *London Times* (15 Aug.) says: "Any English lawyer will say that as they [the Committee] could not do this [examine under oath] they could do nothing." We may with great propriety quote English opinion on questions touching Parliamentary practice, for in Parliamentary government they, the English, are the teachers, the leaders of all nations, however ashamed we may be of their ignorance of our geography, our history, and other local matters. The Committee adjourned on motion of M. BLANCHET until 13th of August to meet in Ottawa. On meeting at Ottawa on the 13th August, Mr. BLAKE moved the adjournment of the Committee till the 14th, and in the absence of M. DORION the motion was carried, in opposition to M. BLANCHET's motion to report to the House. But the House was prorogued on the 13th in accordance with the general understanding of both Parties and Sir JOHN MACDONALD's announcement at its adjournment in May. The Governor-General in his answer on that day (the 13th) to the memorial praying him "not to prorogue Parliament"—replied that "were it possible at the present time to make a call of the House, my personal embarrassment would disappear, but this is a physical impossibility."

On the 13th of August, a memorial, signed by ninety-one members in a House of two hundred, was presented to the Governor-General, stating that four months had elapsed since Mr. HUNTINGTON had made grave charges of corruption against his constitutional advisers; that, although the House had appointed a Committee to inquire into these charges, the proceedings had, on various grounds, been postponed; that the honour of the country required that no further delay should take place in the investigation—which it is the duty and the undoubted right and privilege of the Commons to prosecute; that any attempt to postpone this inquiry or to remove it from the House, would create the most intense dissatisfaction. In this memorial complaints of postponement of the inquiry are twice made. The only postponement asked by the Ministry is that of the 5th of May, to allow time for the return from Europe of the three principal persons accused—Sir GEORGE CARTIER, Sir HUGH ALLAN, and Mr. ABBOTT—and none will say that the request to adjourn to allow the accused to be present at their trial was unreasonable; but it would have been unjust to the last degree and against all precedent to try them in their absence, and without the possibility of their being present at that time. After the House had decided that witnesses must be examined on oath, the Committee could not take evidence till the Oaths Bill became law, and the complaints of delays previously to the 5th of May were without foundation.

But the Opposition were themselves the chief cause of the delays; first in Parliament, in not heeding Sir JOHN MACDONALD's warning that they were exceeding their powers in passing a Oaths Bill; secondly, in refusing his offer of a Royal Commission to examine witnesses on oath; and thirdly, in Montreal, on the 2nd July, in rejecting the offer to appoint a Royal Commission, making the five members appointed by