

inquiry into the expenditure of those moneys is to take place, it should be in the chamber which alone has the right to vote the money and decide upon the manner in which it is to be expended. If that chamber fails in its duty to inquire into the alleged misappropriation of public moneys, then I think it would be our duty to exercise our legal right, and have the investigation. But that is not the position to-day. A committee has been appointed in the other chamber for the purpose of inquiring into this subject. The opposition, the party to which the hon. leader of the opposition in this House belongs, is ably represented on that committee. There are two of the best lawyers in parliament representing the opposition on the committee, and there is an ex-Minister of Railways; so I do not think there is any fear whatever that the investigation before that committee will not be fairly satisfactory. If it is not satisfactory, then it will be our duty to act, and as I have said, the leader of the opposition has taken a perfectly proper view of it. If the committee of the other House, which is more properly charged with an inquiry of this kind is actually making the inquiry, why should we interfere? Why should we duplicate their work? I do not think there is any reason for it at all. It is true we are not busy, but still there is no object in our undertaking to duplicate here the work which is going on at the same time in another place. There is another technical difficulty that might arise, that documents necessary to use as evidence before our committee might be impounded by the other committee and when we came to inquire into the matter we might have very great difficulty in getting them. I hope I shall always be, as I have been in the past, an upholder of the rights and privileges of this House. But then we must be reasonable, and when no harm is going to be done, and when convenience is to be served by not acting, there is no reason why we should act. When there is occasion for our acting, when it is necessary to uphold the authority of this House, as I said just now, I hope that I shall be always as ready as any other hon. gentleman to do so.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—This appears to me to be an extraordinary circumstance. The government carried out, during last year, a certain contract for which it had no sanction of parliament. We threw out the gov-

ernment measure, yet they went on with the contract. To say now that we have no right to inquire into the matter sounds rather strange. The government, I consider, are going contrary to the law and to the constitution. I remember very well what occurred last year. They went round the corner, and even played sick, in order to get their measure through, yet we are told that we have no right to inquire into the proceedings of the government. If we have not that right, the Senate is no longer of any use and we might as well go home. I say, go on with the committee. I care very little for what the Duke of Argyll may have said in the House of Lords. I look at the common sense of the matter and I say we should inquire why the government have ignored the vote of this House. By a sleight of hand trick the money of the people has been expended contrary to the vote of this House, and yet we are told that we should not make an investigation. I, for one, say that we should go on with our inquiry; otherwise the people of Canada will think very little of us.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—The hon. gentleman from Halifax said that at the confederation debates, when this House was being constituted, it was made an appointed instead of an elective House, largely because an elective House would have power to interfere with the public expenditure, and that, therefore, that was *prima facie* the reason why senators should be appointed. Now, there is a vast distinction between the position we hold with regard to expenditures included in the budget and other expenditures. We have the power to throw out the Supply Bill, but we cannot amend the principle of taxation contained in it, which, under our constitution, is especially reserved for the representatives of the people; but when a measure authorizing public expenditure, a separate matter from the Supply Bill, comes before us, that is quite a different matter. We are called upon to pass the Supply Bill, but if we think there are any reasons why there should be an investigation into the expenditure of the money, we have the power, and it is in the public interest, to make that investigation, and the people will be very thankful and support whatever action this House may take in such a case. As I understand the position at present, the Senate inaugurated the inquiry last session.