

made from time to time to the Department of Trade and Commerce as to the desirability of amending the present law and adopting this legislation.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: I have not had much time to study this Bill, but I understand that it is one which was very much discussed in another place, and I was very much surprised when I found that it had made its way as far as this Chamber. The impression I had—it may have been a wrong one—was that it was not going to be proceeded with this session. I think to some extent the public generally who have been interested in some of the clauses of this Bill have been rather misled, being under the impression that the Bill was not going any further, and suddenly finding it being pushed through in the dying days of the session. My honourable friend has not given us very much of an explanation of the Bill; but I presume that when we go into Committee he will be able to tell us why the Gouvernement has considered it advisable to go on with it after practically dropping it for a time.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It was not dropped.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: It was suspended.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It was delayed.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Put it that way if you will. It was such a delay that I think I am right in saying that the public generally thought that it was not going any further this session.

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

THE SENATE AND MONEY BILLS.

DISCUSSION CONTINUED.

The Senate resumed from May 20 the adjourned debate on the motion for the consideration of the second report of the Special Committee appointed to consider the question of determining what are the rights of the Senate in matters of financial legislation, and whether, under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, it is permissible, and to what extent, or forbidden, for the Senate to amend a Bill embodying financial clauses.

Hon. PASCAL POIRIER: Honourable gentlemen, it has been suggested that I might put in a couple more hours in the discussion of this question. I will spare the House that, and, will simply ask the

forbearance of my honourable colleagues for a few minutes.

The report of my honourable friend from Middleton (Hon. W. B. Ross), after dealing directly with the question, drifts into the opinions expressed by the makers of Confederation. I will pass over most of them, but will refer to that of Sir John A. Macdonald, who said: "We resolved that the constitution of the Upper House should be in accordance with the British system as nearly as circumstances would allow," which puts us as nearly as possible on an equal footing with the House of Lords in matters of appropriation and money Bills. Sir John Macdonald made no reference to the Senate being entrusted particularly or directly with the safeguarding of the interests of the provinces; he simply assumed that this House would be as far as possible on a par with the House of Lords. Mr. Brown also expressed an opinion as to the duties and the status of the Senate of Canada, and here is what he said:

The desire was to render the Upper House a thoroughly independent body—one that would be in the best position to canvass dispassionately the measures of this House, and stand up for the public interests in opposition to hasty or partisan legislation.

These views have been adopted. We are here from our several provinces for the purpose, among other of opposing hasty and partisan legislation; and the Almighty knows if we have not ourselves been as partisan as members of the other House.

Now, this disposes pretty well of the contention of this report, that having been appointed specially to protect the provinces, we are entrusted with the right to interfere with appropriations and money Bills referring to the provinces. Neither the constitution nor the opinion of the Fathers of Confederation confirms this. We certainly have authority over those questions, but in no more special manner than we have over other general legislation.

Appended to the report of my honourable friend from Middleton is the expression of two leading lawyers of Montreal, Mr. Lafleur and Mr. Aimé Geoffrion. These are clever statements of clever men, and are to me also a brief or plea. But we do not want to be convinced of our authority; what we want to know is how we stand as against the pretensions of the other House; and, instead of having a plea all in our favour, I would have preferred some criticism of the position we apparently intend to take. I will pass that over also. Next comes the expression of Mr. John S. Ewart, K.C., of Ottawa, which in my