

This session, the hon. leader of the opposition put his notice on the paper. That was followed by a notice being put on the notice paper in the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—The notice in the House of Commons was first.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—Last year a promise was given that an investigation should take place by the Senate committee. That has been to a certain extent forestalled by the action of the House of Commons but there is this difference between the motion in that House and the motion in the Senate—the motion that is before the House of Commons deals only with a portion of the subject embraced in the motion before this House. Whether it is wise for us to abrogate our rights and abandon a position that we are justified in taking, and which it is our duty to take, is just one of those questions which have been very ably discussed by my hon. friend from Richmond. Having asserted our right and obtained the promise of the government that this investigation should be held, some better reason should be advanced than any we have heard before we give up the investigation.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Before the motion is put, I wish to set myself right with regard to a remark made by the hon. senator from Richmond in that introductory remark. He said, as I understood him, that I knew a committee had been appointed by the other House when I put my motion on the notice paper.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—Yes.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—That is not correct according to the records. No committee had been appointed by the House of Commons when I gave notice of my motion.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—What I said was this, that my hon. friend knew that a committee had been moved in the House of Commons when he gave this notice. The committee had not been appointed, but notice of its appointment had been given by the premier.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman is quite right in his statement, but if he will read the notice put on

the paper by the premier he will find that it was confined exclusively to an investigation into the expenditure of moneys granted by the Dominion. It was as follows:—

Resolved, That a special committee of the House be appointed to inquire into the expenditure of subsidies granted by the parliament of Canada in aid of the construction of the Drummond County Railway and into all negotiations and transactions between the government of Canada and any member or officer thereof, or any person in its behalf, and the Drummond County Railway Company, or any director, officer or person in the company's behalf, relating to the acquiring of the said railway by the government; with power to send for papers, persons and records, and to report the evidence to this House, together with the opinion of the said committee thereupon.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—That fact tells against the hon. gentleman's position. That is the reason why he should go on with his motion.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I desire to take exception to the hon. gentleman's reference to myself, when he said that I was aware of certain things when I put my notice on the paper, and that, therefore, I should not now ask for a postponement of the appointment of the committee. I have not asked the House to drop the question, as has been intimated by some hon. gentlemen who have spoken; I have no more desire to drop this inquiry than any one else has, or to do anything which would reflect upon the independence and honour of the Senate. I gave my reasons for asking a postponement for a short time. I did not intimate any intention not to ask for a committee unless circumstances should arise to justify it. When the right hon. premier put his notice on the paper in the House of Commons, it was simply to make an inquiry into the expenditure of subsidies granted by the Federal government. On seeing that notice, I at once drafted this motion which I thought covered all the points that it was necessary to investigate, my object being to inquire not only into the expenditure of subsidies which had been granted by the Dominion government, but also into the expenditure of subsidies given by municipalities and by the Quebec government, whether in money or land—to ascertain whether they had really been spent in the construction of the road, in order to ascertain whether we should be justified in ratifying a bargain which we believed to be extravagant and improvident. That was the idea I had at the time, and I think that was the idea of those who approved