

we trust, to enable our readers to comprehend the scope of the questions involved.

It is almost needless to state, that the publication of the correspondence, and the evidence, even before the Commission, produced a profound and painful sensation throughout Canada and the English-speaking world.

We need not tarry to discuss the advisability of the disallowance of the Oath's Bill, nor the exercise of the Prerogative in proroguing Parliament. We admit the right of the Governor General, as the representative of Her Majesty, to prorogue Parliament at pleasure. It is an absolute right, but one which must, after all, be exercised in the interests of good government. The haste with which Black Rod knocked at the door of the Commons, immediately upon the Speaker taking the chair, and summoned the members to the Senate Chamber, to use mild terms, savors strongly of prorogations in the days of James the First and Charles the First. But, it is said, Parliament was only to meet in August *pro forma*, to receive the report of the committee, and then adjourn. If so, why was not opportunity afforded the committee to report? Why such indecent haste? When Parliament adjourned in May, it was not known the Oath's Bill would be disallowed. The Commons fully expected a report from the Committee in August. They could not possibly have agreed to immediate prorogation after the reception of the report. That report might be adverse to Ministers. The evidence elicited before the committee might fully sustain the charges, and stamp the Government guilty. An immediate prorogation would, in that case, leave men in office, during the recess, "steeped to the lips in corruption," and richly deserving impeachment. The facts and the circumstances are against the idea of any such arrangement, notwithstanding Sir John A. Macdonald's statement to the contrary, corroborated though it be, by an honorable member's famous letter, now embalmed in a State paper of the Governor General to the Colonial office.

These points, however, are not to our purpose in this connection, and we cheerfully pass them by. The two main questions which present themselves for our consideration are: First, The constitutionality of the Royal Commission; and secondly, The evidence produced before it.

The legality of the Royal Commission rests upon an Act of the Canadian Parliament, 31st Victoria, ch. 38, 1868. It says:—