

8. If there are no yearly reports since the late T. Chase Casgrain has resigned as president, is it the intention to have an annual report to present to Parliament, giving some information as asked above?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Honourable members, this subject is of considerable importance. The answer to the honourable gentleman's inquiry is as follows:

1. Yes.
2. The Commission issues reports on specific cases, not annual reports. The latest report on the Rainy Lake and Upper Boundary Waters reference was presented to the two Governments last week. Copies of this report will, in due course, be available at the office of the secretary of the Canadian section of the Commission.

3. Charles A. Magrath, Chairman; Sir William Hearst; George W. Kyte.

4. (a) \$7,500 annually, less 10 per cent.

(b) Actual travelling expenses.

(c) No subsistence allowance.

5. Under the rules adopted at the inception of the Commission, and which were submitted to the two Governments before being put into operation, provision was made for two fixed meetings, one in April in Washington and the other in October in Ottawa. Other meetings are arranged as the occasion requires. When cases come before the Commission for settlement or investigation public hearings are held on either side of the boundary at places that will best serve the convenience of all the interested parties in both countries. Many of the matters coming before the Commission, and particularly the larger investigations under article 9 of the Treaty of 1909 establishing the Commission, such as those relating to the St. Lawrence Deep Waterway, the pollution of boundary waters and the Trail Smelter, have involved very extensive technical inquiries and conferences between the Commission and technical experts representing the two Governments and other interests. The work of the Commission itself is carried on to a large extent by correspondence between the Ottawa and Washington offices, but executive meetings of the whole Commission are held from time to time either at the Commission's offices in Ottawa or Washington or at other places as may be found convenient.

6. No.

7. Answered by 6.

8. No yearly reports by the Commission have ever been issued. It is true that after the Commission was organized, at the end of its first year, the Canadian secretary submitted a report to the Canadian Commissioners largely for the purpose of having on record the rules of procedure as applied in

actual practice to the first cases coming before the Commission. This was not, it will be observed, a report from either the Commission as a whole or from the Canadian section of the Commission to the Canadian Government. It has never been the practice on either side to make annual reports from the Commission to the respective Governments. Each question coming before the Commission, when finally disposed of, is communicated to the two Governments either in the form of an order, in cases where the Commission has final jurisdiction, or in the form of a report making recommendations to the two Governments. The question of each section making an annual report to its Government was considered in the early years of the Commission, when Mr. Casgrain was Canadian Chairman, and it was concluded that such a practice would be inconsistent with one of the basic principles governing the work of the Commission, which was that the two sections, Canadian and United States, should under no circumstances function separately, but should act as one complete tribunal.

THE SENATE AND MONEY BILLS

DISCUSSION

Before the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. J. HUGHES: Honourable members, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter which probably has been overlooked. Last Thursday, on the motion for second reading of Appropriation Bill No. 4, the honourable leader on this side of the House (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) stated:

I am of course aware of the limitation of this Chamber with respect to an increase in the vote—something which I do not suppose anyone would rise to ask—and I know we cannot decrease it except by rejecting the whole Bill.

In 1918 a special committee, appointed the previous year, reported that the Senate had the power to amend money bills. The chairman of that committee was Hon. Mr. Ross, an eminent jurist and subsequently leader of one of the parties in this Chamber. The report is short, and I should like to read it into Hansard. The committee had the advice of Mr. E. Lafleur, Mr. Aimé Geoffrion, and Mr. John S. Ewart, and the report was in accordance with their opinions.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I would suggest my honourable friend ask that the document be printed in Hansard to refresh the memories of honourable senators who were in the House when the report was adopted, and for the benefit of new members.