

Mr. MEIGHEN: The newspaper men were all heard.

Mr. CARVELL: A Bill like this is particularly within the province and jurisdiction of the Senate. Some of the best business men in Canada are in the Senate; indeed, we are supposed to have none but good business men in the Senate.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Do not look at me.

Mr. CARVELL: I am looking at my hon. friend because I anticipate that he will be there before long. Legislation of this character adopted by the Senate is entitled to careful consideration at our hands. It is in proper accordance with our parliamentary system that the Senate should initiate legislation of this kind. Now that they have dealt with the Bill, I feel almost like accepting it in toto. Any practising lawyer who has any company business realizes that the Companies Act of Canada has been almost hopeless. Ontario has a good Act; some of the western provinces—Alberta, for instance—have up-to-date Acts. In my practice I look upon the Dominion Companies Act as almost obsolete, and for that reason I am very anxious to see this Bill go through.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may say, for the information of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that in view of the tremendous pressure of the legislative programme of this session, I am not surprised if the Minister of Finance was under the impression that he would not likely reach the Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think the Minister of Finance really had reference to the Bill which I introduced in the House.

Mr. CURRIE: No, to the Companies Act of the Senate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill I introduced was practically a new Act, and I had arranged with the Minister of Finance to refer it to a special committee. Later on we agreed that it would not be pressed at this session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is also a Bill No. U2 of the Senate amending the Companies Act.

Mr. CURRIE: The Bill referred to is this Senate Bill, there is no question about that whatever. There is nothing in the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) that the Senate has considered this Bill, when we realize that the Senate, in amending a money Bill, the other day forgot that

[Mr. R. B. Bennett.]

there was such a thing in history as a fight between the King and Parliament as to who should grant Supply, and caused as great inconvenience thereby. That should prevent us in this House from viewing too seriously the fact that the Senate has been considering this Bill for a long time. There was a time when the Senate left Finance Bills alone. Of recent date, however, the Senate has given itself over to considering that the question of the finances of the country rests entirely upon its shoulders, and a week or ten days ago serious discussion was undertaken in the Senate in regard to Supply, and senators there held the view that the Senate has a perfect right to deal with Supply. They claim that this House has only made a rule dealing with Supply, and they ignore altogether the fact that there was a revolution in England and a change in the constitution which placed the granting of supply in the hands of Parliament. Parliament in England has never given the privilege of granting supply over to the House of Lords, and I am certain this Parliament will not give it over to the Senate. This Bill has been the subject of a great deal of discussion in the Senate. The matter was given considerable publicity in the press. Many of us do not read what the press says about things that happen in the Senate, because we are so much taken up with what we say ourselves. Other hon. members have asked me when the Companies' Bill was to be taken up in the House of Commons. If the Companies' Act is to be seriously dealt with in this House it should go before a special committee, if we want a revision of the Act at all. The Senate has sent a few amendments here which appear to be quite harmless, but the Act they propose is a most drastic change of the Dominion Companies' Act. In view of the fact that the Companies' Act has received a great accession of strength from decisions of the Privy Council and the courts as to jurisdiction, it would be a wise

9 p.m. thing for the Secretary of State Department to take up the whole matter during the interval, and at the next session of Parliament introduce some Bill that will be workable and readable. I wish again to protest, because I notice that the advertising clause still remains struck out, and for that reason I think the newspaper proprietors should have been heard before this House. Newspaper proprietors and the public generally have no influence whatever with the Senate, and in that case, what