

hands, that it is desirable that witnesses before that committee should be examined under oath. Unfortunately, for the sake of that motion, the majority of the members of the Public Accounts Committee did not agree with the proposition, as appears by the report on the table. Accordingly, it becomes necessary now to ascertain whether a majority of the House favor that view. I may say, Sir, that the motion before the committee was met by many objections. One objection was that the Parliament of Canada had no jurisdiction to confer such a power upon a select standing committee. I do not know that that objection was taken with a great deal of confidence in its soundness on the part of the Minister of Railways, who first raised it, and other members of the Government. The next objection, I believe, was that raised by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). His objection was that the Ontario Parliament did not recognize such a practice, and, although the hon. member for South Norfolk had never been able to discover anything else that was good in the record of the Ontario Government, he was able to recognize this one virtue—that they refused to allow examination on oath regarding the expenditure of public money.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask to what occasion the hon. gentlemen refers?

MR. MULOCK. The first meeting of the Public Accounts Committee when the subject was discussed.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is not in order, and that it would be an inconvenient mode of discussing this question. I do not think it is in order to refer to the discussions in the Public Accounts Committee. There may be different views as to what was said, and that may embarrass the discussion.

MR. MULOCK. I think that, when the report of any committee is under discussion, anything that came before the committee respecting the subject of that report, is in order.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The point I raise, Mr. Speaker, is that it is out of order to refer to what was said during the discussion in the Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. MULOCK. I suppose the hon. gentleman would wish that what he said, and the points he took upon that occasion, which have thus far prevented this resolution being adopted, should not be known to the public.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On the contrary, I will repeat them to-day.

MR. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman repeats them to-day, there can be no disadvantage in my anticipating them. At any rate, I do not wish to delay the proceedings of the House, or the consideration of this question by bringing in any controversial matters, because the question is sufficiently broad and substantial to entitle it to the support of the House, without bringing in any other question. But I was saying that objections have been raised to the passing of this measure. One is that the Parliament of Canada has no jurisdiction. Another is that the Ontario Government would not allow this course to be taken, and, because of its wickedness in that respect, it received, for once, the support