

no formal resolutions, I am able to say that the Bill has been the subject of a great deal of thought by honourable members of this House; and it is proper that such should be the case. With these remarks I am content that the Bill should pass at once as laid before us.

There is, however, one further remark that may not be out of place. I look forward in another Session or two, to the time when we may treat the Supply Bill in a fashion somewhat different from the way we have treated it in the past. It comes before us in a solid block. That difficulty is of course palliated by the fact that, as I have already stated, the Bill has been the subject of a good deal of individual consideration. In another part of the world there is a practice which we have not yet adopted, namely, that of sending the Supply Bill back to the House of Commons for reconsideration. In the Australian constitution, which precludes the Senate from amending the Supply Bill, there is a clause providing that, although the Senate may not alter the Bill, it may send it back to the Lower House with the request to reconsider the items. That method has only the effect of provoking friendly discussion, for, after all, the Senate cannot interfere with the Supply Bill if the Government insists on it. It might be practicable to have our Supply Bill come up to us in sections. Take for example the Department of Railways, or the Post Office: that would not be too big a subject for this House to deal with at one time. If the estimates came before us section by section, instead of all coming together, we might concentrate our efforts upon each section. I remember the man who complained that his master was in the habit of throwing the yearly statutes at him: he said he did not mind that at all, but when he took to throwing at him the consolidated statutes, he objected.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: It was too big a load.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: I feel the same way about the Supply Bill. If it were sent up to us piece by piece we could deal with it more satisfactorily, but when we receive the consolidated Supply Bill it almost frightens one to look at it or attempt to say anything about it. The future will take care of itself, but I think that, without our Constitution being changed at all, there is room for a little friendly interchange of views between this House and the other, and if that method were adopted the complaint made here that the work is deferred until late in the Session and is then dumped on us in one mass would

be obviated. Furthermore, that interchange of views would be, I believe, an advantage to the country.

That is all I have to say at present with regard to the Supply Bill. I hope that when we meet next year we shall be able to congratulate ourselves upon Canada having had in 1928, in the field, the forest, the mine and the factory, a prosperous and splendid year.

Right Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM: Honourable gentlemen, there is a good deal to think about in what the honourable Leader on the other side of the House has said. I want to add a suggestion that I think comes within the four corners of the Supply Bill. In the city of Montreal the C.N.R. has expended considerable money and contemplates expending many millions more for the creation of new terminals, particularly, I think, for the passenger traffic of that railway. This is essential, because the traffic requires it. It is necessary for the safety of the public, and it must be done in order to carry out an order of the Board of Railway Commissioners, particularly along the line of the elimination of many level crossings. The C.P.R., with its very rapidly increasing traffic, will soon have to make an improvement or enlargement of its facilities. The suggestion I have to make to the Government, the Canadian National and the C.P.R. is this, that it is not too late for representatives of the two latter to sit around a table together and discuss the possibility—yes, the advisability—of creating in the great city of Montreal a central union station for all outgoing and all incoming passenger traffic. This is according to modern railway activity. It is almost necessary for the city of Montreal, it would be a great boon to the travelling public, from Europe as well as from other parts of Canada, and to my mind it would be an economy for the two railways.

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.

He said: Honourable gentlemen, may I take occasion to say that the surprise expressed by some honourable member of the Senate at the length of our first adjournment and the curtailment of the work of this House has not been justified. I said at the time that I thought we should have plenty of time to cope with all the work and that before prorogation we should be awaiting the