

fell upon the Government of Canada, in connection with the return of its army to Canada and the large gratuity which was granted to its soldiers. There was also a very substantial number of outstanding accounts that had accumulated during preceding years, which had to be cleared up in that period. In that connection I might refer also to the fact that last year a very substantial amount, being a balance due to Canada by Britain in connection with the adjustment of our accounts, was taken as a credit to the Government last year, whereas it was an old account which really belonged to a former Administration.

My honourable friend referred to the desirability of immigration to the extent of a quarter of a million people per year. I heartily concur in the suggestion that we need more people in Canada; but I submit that the policy that is being pursued by the present Government is causing our industries to cease and no new ones to be established.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: There is a big one being established in Cornwall.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: The large exodus of our industrial population does not accord with an immigration policy such as my honourable friend suggests as being of advantage to the country. One cannot view with any satisfaction the prospects for the immediate future. Our industrial activities have been so curtailed as to affect seriously the revenues of our transportation companies. With falling national revenue, and a largely decreased population due to industrial stagnation, our transportation companies are finding themselves increasingly embarrassed, and with the prospects of a lighter crop than we had last year I have serious apprehension as to what the results of the operation of the Canadian National Railways may be a year hence.

I sincerely join in the observation made by the leader on this side of the House that these matters of such serious importance should receive the best possible consideration by the business interests of this country, whose voice should be raised in protest against a continuation of excessive expenditures at this time.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

THIRD READING

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND moved the third reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

PENSION BILL

THE SENATE INSISTS UPON ITS AMENDMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the following Message from the House of Commons:

Resolved, That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House disagrees with their amendments to clauses 2, 6, 9 sub-section (1a), (1b), (1b) (i), 10, 15 and 16 of Bill No. 255, An Act to amend "The Pensions' Act", for the following reason:

These clauses are the result of recommendations made by the Royal Commission on Pension, Insurance and Re-establishment, as submitted to the House of Commons during the present session.

To clause 19 of the said Bill for the following reason:

It is considered that permanency in rate of pension is indispensable to the welfare of pensioners generally.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I notice, honourable gentlemen, that the reason why we are called upon to recede from the position taken by this House upon the Pension Bill is that the Royal Commission on Pensions has recommended the Bill as presented to the House. Apparently for that reason it was accepted in another place. I should like to know, honourable gentlemen, when the Parliamentary institutions of this country arrived at the stage at which they must abdicate their functions in favour of a Royal Commission. Are we here to exercise our own discretion and judgment in legislating, or are we here to bow our necks to every Commission that may be appointed by the Government? They may dignify this Commission by calling it a Royal Commission. It is no more a Royal Commission than any other Commission that has been appointed and is composed of friends of the Government. Has this Senate reached such a position that it is to be told by the Government of the day that because a Commission has recommended a certain thing we must swallow it—that we must abandon not merely our right but our duty to give consideration to whatever recommendations may be made or whatever Bill is submitted to this House?

May I repeat what was said yesterday, that if the Senate had not taken the matter in hand and appointed a Committee to consider the Bill in all its details and referred the Bill to that Committee, it would not have been considered at all; because, as my honourable friend the leader of the Government very properly pointed out when the Bill was submitted to us, it would be impossible to consider it in the closing hours of the Session, when prorogation was in the offing, and the only thing to do would be to renew the bonus for another year.

This is one of the measures regarding which the Senate should protest most strongly. It reveals a policy which has been followed for a considerable time by the Government of holding back till the dying hours of the Session and introducing into the Senate at the eleventh hour the most important measures of the Session. Why, honourable gentlemen, we may