

tion. When they looked to all the surroundings of the Pacific charter, and the efforts that had been made to elicit the facts connected with the giving of that charter, he could only say that he saw no reason to change the opinion which he held when he felt it to be his duty to move for a committee of that House to enquire into the facts connected with the giving of that Charter. However, he had the mortification to be refused. One of the reasons for that refusal was that a similar committee had been asked for in the House of Commons, but he maintained that he was entitled to have had that committee in order that the Senate might have an independent enquiry into the facts. He might also mention the disallowance of the Oath's Bill, and he wished to allude to the facts in justification of his honorable friend opposite [Mr. Letellier.] That Bill was introduced into the Commons on one day and passed through the several subsequent stages on the next. The Bill came up to the Senate, and after some hesitation his hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior, undertook to father that bill. Further, they were justified in supposing that the Government of this country advised His Excellency to assent to it.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL remarked that there were strong misgivings on the part of the Attorney General from the first, as whether the bill would be allowed by the Imperial Government.

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE admitted that, because the Attorney General said in the written opinion which he gave Lord Dufferin, not as the adviser of the Crown, but as a lawyer he doubted it. However, it could not be regarded in any sense as a party measure, receiving as it did the unanimous assent of the Parliament of this country. He asked was it wrong that the Parliament of this country should require to get substantial reasons on the part of the law officers of the Crown of England for the disallowance of the bill? He insisted that they had a right to know what those reasons were, but instead of any reason being given, they were simply furnished with the fact that the bill had been disallowed. Now this was a bill solely relating to the internal economy of Parliament, and it was sent home singly and contrary to the usual practise which was to send the volume of Statutes for revision by the Imperial authorities, and it was received at the Colonial Office on the 22nd of May according to Lord Kimberley's letter. The committee of enquiry adjourned to meet in Montreal on the 2nd July. The

interval between the 22nd May and the 1st of July passed before it was made known that the bill had been disallowed; but on the 1st of July, the day before the committee met, the fact was made known by Proclamation. Now he held that this was a sufficient interval in which to have done one of two things, either to have legalized that bill, or to have so amended the British North America Act, as would have put this Parliament in such a position as would have enabled them to clothe their committee with power to take evidence under oath. They had no evidence that any such course was ever suggested to Mr. Gladstone, who could not have refused it as the House of Commons had so recently passed a similar bill. Now speaking with all due deference on this subject, and in justification of the position taken by his hon. friend opposite as well as of others, he held that it was the opinion of the Government that the bill was legal when they advised His Excellency to assent to it. But the 91st clause of the British North America Act was the one relied on. That, however, was not the only clause in the Act giving the Parliament of this country power to deal with this question. By the 91st clause of the British North America Act, the legislature of this country has power to enact measures for the good government of the country, and that surely included such a measure as they had passed. But the 18th clause referred to the internal economy of Parliament and under that also they had the power they sought. [The hon. gentleman here quoted from the Act and proceeded]. There was another point connected with this fact. What was the Parliament of this country? Was it not the highest inquisitorial court in the land? And were they to be told that while they had the power to erect courts and clothe those courts with all the necessary machinery to carry which acts into effect,—that Parliament that has the power to clothe police magistrates with power to take evidence upon oath, had not the power to legislate in such a way as to clothe its own Committee with that power? To show how unwise it was for the Home Government to interfere in the way they had done, he quoted from the Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration, by Earl Grey as follows: "In a colony like Canada, where representative institutions have attained their full development, and a Governor is aided in his administrative duties by Ministers who are required to possess the confidence of the Legislature, exceedingly little inter-