"beyond the competence of the Canadian Parliament, I desire to renew to you as Chairman of the Committee the offer made by me on the part of the Government on the floor of the House of Commons, to issue a Royal Commission addressed to the gentlemen forming the Committee which would confer upon them all the powers given to the Committee by the House of Commons, including the examination of witnesses under oath, and the power to send for persons, papers and records, and containing the same provisions as to the votes of the Members of the Committee and yourself as Chairman, as was ordered by the House. The acceptance of this Commission will enable this Committee to proceed with the enquiry, and the examination of witnesses on oath without any important delay. I shall cause a copy of this letter to be sent to each Member of your Committee.

"I have the honor to be,

"Your obdt. servant,

"J. A. MACDONALD.

"To Hon. J. H. Cameron, &c., &c.

"P.S.—The Commission will contain a clause enjoining the Commissioners to report to the Speaker of the House of Commons.

" (Signed) J. A. MACDONALD."

The majority of the Committee are understood to have been willing to return a favor able reply to this proposal had their colleagues assented, but neither Mr. Dorion nor Mr. Blake considered themselves at liberty to accept the arrangement, and stated their reasons in the following terms:—

" To the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald.

"SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd inst., " received this morning, enclosing a copy of a letter addressed by you to the Hon. J. H. "Cameron, Chairman of the Special Committee of the House of Commons, now sitting in " Montreal, in which you state that, as the Act which would have enabled the Committee "to examine witnesses under oath had been disallowed, as being beyond the competence of "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, ad-"dressed 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 Gov "ernment 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. "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 au-"thority 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 en-" quiry 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