

great importance and great difficulty. This is especially true of the second measure, because it was breaking into new territory, while the other was not so different from its predecessors. Both bills—the former in part and the latter in larger measure—were the consequence of deliberations and findings of the Banking Commission headed by Lord Macmillan. In the other House, the initial body to deal with these bills, they had to go through the most ponderous procedure ever adopted. They were the subject of debate, amendment and sub-amendment. They passed through all sorts of vicissitudes before they reached even the stage where they could be referred to the appropriate committee of that House. I have no criticism to make of the fact that such delays occurred. Possibly, had I been leading the Opposition in the other House, the expedition would not have been any greater. Having reached committee stage, deliberations on these measures took not only weeks, but months. Everybody who even alleged himself to be an expert had to be heard; almost every crank had to be heard; and if any had been denied a hearing, who in this House would have been the loudest and bitterest in his complaints? If I were to pause for an answer, and all were to answer at once, I know what the answer would be.

This Bill, having come back from committee into the other House, was again attacked with renewed vigour from all sorts of angles, amendments and sub-amendments were offered, and although we were here ready to receive it, it did not come. I am not criticizing, but I do believe the man who passes judgment on the lack of expedition with which the Bill came here is the one who should say who was responsible for its delay in the other House. He should find fault with those who delayed it, not by implication, but by standing up manfully and stating how it was delayed, and by whom. I have not heard that from the honourable senator from Parkdale.

Then, inferentially at least, the Bill is the subject of momentous criticism and challenge because it came here within sixty minutes of its passing the other House. I think it came within thirty minutes; but I wonder what added virtue it would have if it had been delayed three or four days. Should we be any better qualified to address ourselves to it? What criminality, or weakness, or at least failure in fidelity to public duty, is inherent in its coming to us within thirty minutes of passing the other House?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: That is not the point.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No, that is not a point. There was no point.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: The point is that we are ignoring our rules and trampling them under foot when we give the second reading to a Bill within less than sixty minutes instead of allowing two days' notice. That is the point.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well. Then the foot-race from one House to the other is of no particular importance.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I wondered why it was so much stressed. What was wrong in our unanimous waiving of the rule calling for one or two days' notice of the second reading?—something that is done very frequently, and has to be done if the two Houses are to work together as the Parliament of Canada; something to which all accede because it cannot be avoided, and to which even the honourable member himself gave accession. I asked for unanimous consent to move the second reading, and gave my reasons, stating the importance of the matter, and nobody objected. On the motion for the second reading I stated the principle of the Bill, and again the honourable gentleman did not object. I stated that the principle of the Bill could be said to be one thing only, the establishment of a Central Bank; that there were differences of opinion as to how that ought to be accomplished, but on that point no one was voting one way or the other at the second reading. I suggested that anything in the way of formal debate might be deferred until the third reading; then, the Bill having been reviewed in committee, we should be in a better position to discuss it. Immediately another member thought otherwise I acceded to his position, and we went on with the debate. This conduct is considered entirely unworthy of the Senate. The honourable member trembles for the fate of this body because we took a course to which every honourable member agreed, and by which all stand loyally except himself.

Now I come to a discussion of the measure. The honourable member dislikes the Bill because in some mysterious way, he says, it is going to put the Central Bank under the control of chartered banks. The bugbear which terrorizes him is wholly different from that which keeps the honourable senator opposite (Hon. Mr. Casgrain) awake at nights.