

isters who have seats in the other House to appear here to explain their legislation, but, of course, not to vote.

The honourable gentleman went on to express the following opinion:

In my opinion the whole question involves simply a matter of procedure with us. We need only to amend our Rules in order to have the Ministers appear here, if they are willing to come. They do attend now before our committees.

A further contribution to the same debate was made by the right honourable member from Eganville, who sits at my right (Right Hon. Mr. Graham). His conclusion was:

I do think that some way might be found to lessen the difficulties that exist in the transaction of business between the two Chambers. If any government does not wish to have Ministers with portfolios in the Senate, I think it might be represented here by at least three or four Ministers without portfolio, to whom it could confide its business.

So much for the efforts and suggestions made to obtain a larger share of legislation for this Chamber. The evidence that I have thus far adduced makes it plain, I submit, that the Senate has never evaded its responsibilities or shirked its work.

Now, let me turn to another chapter of the Senate's record. Speaking in this House in 1906, Sir Richard Cartwright said:

It is not by any manner of means a trifling thing when I say that the value of a Senate is not only in what the Senate does, but in what the Senate prevents other people from doing.

Critics who make merry over what the Senate has cost the country always take care not to mention what the Senate has saved the country. A few minutes may be profitably devoted to a consideration of the services rendered by the Senate in this latter regard.

As early as 1875 the Senate displayed its concern for saving public funds by rejecting a Bill for the construction of the Esquimaux and Nanaimo Railway. That Bill proposed an expenditure of \$650,000, and a land grant of 1,300,000 acres, both of which were saved for the country by the action of the Senate. Even if the land were not worth more than \$1 per acre, that would represent another saving of \$1,300,000.

The same regard for safeguarding public funds was exhibited by the Senate in 1897. In that year the House of Commons passed a Bill for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway and to provide for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. The Senate rejected the Bill. In 1898 the House of Commons passed a new Bill with respect

to the same project, which was approved by the Senate, and according to the figures then submitted there was a saving of over \$700,000, as compared with the 1897 proposal.

In 1898 the Senate rejected a Bill for the construction of a railway from Atlin to Dawson City. That Bill involved, by way of subsidy, a gift of 25,000 acres of mineral lands for each mile of railway, and as it was proposed to construct a road about 150 miles in length, that would mean a total gift of 3,750,000 acres of mineral lands to the promoters. During the debate it was alleged, and not successfully disputed, that these mineral lands were worth at that time \$10 an acre. At that figure the saving was \$37,500,000.

In the sessions of 1911 and 1912 the Senate opposed a Bill that was first introduced in the other House in 1911, and again in 1912, to aid highway construction; and the same Bill being introduced in the same House in the session of 1912-13, the Senate again opposed and amended it. After its amendments had been sent back to the Commons, no further message was received from the Commons, and the Bill died with prorogation.

The bills in question did not mention the amount to be expended by the Dominion, but provided "for a subsidy to be paid to any province for the construction of any highways, not exceeding such a sum as might in any year be voted by Parliament for that purpose." Therefore, if the Bill had become law, there would have been an enormous drain upon the Dominion treasury, because, as we know from the experiences of recent years, each province would have embarked on an expensive plan of highway construction. My recollection is that it was stated that \$25,000,000 would be the amount of the first grant from this Parliament, but I have been unable to verify this in the records, although I remember distinctly that it was stated in the press, if not in Parliament, that such would be the initial outlay.

In 1913 the Senate opposed the Naval Aid Bill, involving an expenditure of \$35,000,000, until the verdict of the electors could be obtained on the dissolution of Parliament. The Bill with the Senate amendment was not proceeded with.

In 1924 twenty-six Bills, known as the Canadian National Branch Lines Bills, providing for an expenditure of \$28,311,300, were introduced in the Commons. The Senate rejected seven of these bills, and the saving thus effected amounted to \$12,249,000.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY.