

court), we should take all those matters into consideration, and, to use a homely phrase, make the amendment sensible. I may be criticized by my colleagues in the Government for making such a suggestion at the present moment, but I do so because I have some responsibility in connection with the administration of the Act. I do not intend, however, to move an amendment, for the House of Commons, the governing body that has to provide the funds, has expressed by its action a desire that these reports should be made in a certain manner. I do feel, though, that it was a mistake to have the Act expire on the 1st of March instead of the 31st.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: May I repeat what I said—that it was with considerable hesitation I suggested my amendment; not because I did not think it was a proper one, for in fact I believe it was quite proper, but because of the fact that if the amendment were adopted the Bill would have to go back to the House of Commons and that might very seriously inconvenience both Houses. My honourable friend has discussed a point that is entirely different from that which I raised. The termination of the Act is a question which was not at all involved in my suggested amendment, and as to that question, of course, I have no comment to make.

I rise at this moment merely to say that I do not propose to insist on the suggested amendment. Since I was on my feet before, I have realized that in any case the information which would be covered by my amendment could easily be obtained at any period next session.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: Yes, by putting questions on the Order Paper.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: Exactly; and in view of that, I do not want to stand for a moment in the way of legislation, and do not insist on the amendment I suggested.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Honourable members, I should like to suggest to my honourable friend the probable source of that amendment to which he objects. I thoroughly agree with him that if the Act says he must make a report fifteen days after its expiration he cannot make a real report. It has always been insisted upon, in regard to Bills for the construction of branch railways, that a report of all the expenditures and the workings should be laid before Parliament within fifteen days after the opening of the following session. But that was a different thing from what the present Bill calls for. The expenditures on those branch lines were checked up from day to day, and from week to week, and so far

as the expenditures were concerned, the reports could be made in a very few days. I imagine that this amendment has been taken from the standard clause included in all branch line railway Bills in recent years, and that it has been inserted in this Bill without full consideration being given to what was meant by the demand for a real accounting within fifteen days after the expiration of this Act. While I agree with my honourable friend the Minister of Labour in the opinion that the Bill in this form hampers him, I must leave him to work out his own salvation, feeling that he is competent and will be able to do it, though he cannot within fifteen days make as full a report as ought to be made.

Hon. R. DANDURAND: This legislation proposes to give greater powers to the Administration to maintain "peace, order and good government in Canada."

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Does that mean good government or bad government?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I merely quote the words "good government in Canada." Now, my honourable friend has just indicated, with respect to this Bill, that at present we have bad government in Canada. I am referring, not to the Administration itself, but to the fact that there is not the right arrangement as between the two Houses of Parliament for the conduct of the country's business. Would senators and members of Parliament not be better informed if every minister, for the purpose of explaining bills, could appear in the House in which he has not a seat? For example, would it not have been to the advantage of the House of Commons that the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Robertson) should be able to go there and make clear the intricacies of this measure, which he will be administering?

The Right Hon. the Prime Minister is credited with possessing a spirit of initiative. I know he is interested in maintaining harmonious and efficient relations between the two Chambers. He may be unaware of the discussion that we had here on this matter at the beginning of the present session. If that is so, could it not be drawn to his attention? And when he has a few moments of leisure, perhaps he might consider the suggestion that his colleague could present bills here during the long debate on the Address or on the Budget in the other House, and that the Minister of Labour ought to be able to cross over to the Commons to explain bills. I am under the impression that our honourable friend the Minister has been criticized because he has a seat in the Senate.