

we will have a committee of the Senate to investigate the matter." Would it not be better not to have a fight with the Commons? Let the Commons attend to their business and we will attend to ours, without having a collision with the Commons. Supposing the hon. gentleman says the report of the House of Commons is not what was borne out by the evidence taken, and we will appoint a committee of our own? Is not that a gauntlet thrown down to the Commons to stand up for a fight? I do not think the purchase of the Drummond County Railway was spoken of in stronger terms than this railroad deal we will have before us shortly, and should we lead the public to believe that we will get into a fury one session and denounce a contract as a scandal and as a disgrace, and demand a committee to investigate into it, and then let it drop? What will the papers say? How will we feel ourselves? We will feel that all this abuse we have heaped upon the Klondike deal is a mere bagatelle and we are going to treat it just in the same way as the Drummond County Railway. We will have that dropped. I must apologize for the course I have taken, in opposing the resolution of the leader of the opposition. I do not acknowledge any leader in the House myself, nor do I think the opposition should have a leader. I think we should act according to our own views. I am under no government except my own conscience, and having that I am induced to make these remarks. I think we are stultifying ourselves and we are lessening our influence in the country and all we have to say about the Klondike matter will amount to nothing. They will say that we will treat that just as we did the Drummond County Railway matter.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The House will allow me to say a few words in respect to this matter, inasmuch as I have been in a rather unexpected manner brought into the discussion. I speak only for myself. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman from Richmond (Mr. Miller) in saying that we have the constitutional right, the strict legal right, to inquire into a question concerning the expenditure of money just as the House of Commons have the right to inquire into it, but every one knows that the English constitution and English parliamentary practice are a matter of precedent,

and a matter of compromise, and a matter of etiquette and convenience.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—So is ours.

Hon. Mr. POWER—So is ours very largely. Now it may be that, under the strict wording of the British North America Act and the Act passed in amendment of it in 1876, our committees have a right to inquire into questions like the one which is now under consideration, and it is barely possible we might have the right to amend a money bill, but this House has never undertaken to exercise the right to interfere with a money bill in any way, and I remember that the hon. gentleman from Richmond when he occupied the chair of this House—a chair which he filled with great dignity has ruled resolutions out of order because they indirectly dealt with the expenditure of money.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—Have you the citations?

Hon. Mr. POWER—I was quite unprepared for this discussion, but I can get the citations, as I was myself a victim of my hon. friend's ruling on two occasions. We have, perhaps the strict legal right to deal with this matter, but I think the position taken by the hon. leader of the opposition is on the whole a sound and judicious one. One of the reasons given in the discussion on confederation in the Canadian parliament of that day why it was thought that the upper house should not be elective was that an elective upper house would think it had the same right to deal with money questions which the lower house has, and that a nominated upper house would not be so likely to trench upon ground which was supposed to be peculiar to the lower house and there would be less danger of conflict between the two houses. Notwithstanding that view, if the public interest called upon us to inquire into any expenditure of money, we should make the inquiry, but I do not think at the present time that the public interests do call upon us. We could not vote the moneys which were expended in connection with the Drummond County Railway and we could not have controlled in any way the Act under which they were appropriated, and consequently it seems to me the more reasonable thing is that if an