

I realize that hon. members are entirely within their rights in asking for any returns, I suggest that they give a little consideration to the fact that much of the information they ask for could probably be got from the departments. Voluminous returns sometimes have to be brought down which I feel sure no one would ever have time to read. As an illustration I laid on the table of the House this morning a return comprising over twelve hundred typewritten pages, containing correspondence with regard to Dominion Canners, Limited. It may be that some one wants to read it all—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who moved for that?

Mr. COPP: The hon member for Norfolk (Mr. Wallace), I think. And it is only a partial return. Hon. members will see what an amount of work and expense is entailed in preparing the many voluminous reports asked for. As I say, hon. members are within their rights in demanding this information, but I feel sure that much correspondence is included in the information sought that is not of interest and that many details requested might be readily obtained from the departments. I only throw this out as a suggestion that returns could be much more readily brought down if the information asked for was reduced to a minimum.

#### ASSEMBLING OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): I desire again to ask whether the government has any information to give the House as to when the next session will be called? I suggest that it should be very early in the year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I intimated when the question was asked yesterday, I am unable to say whether or not between now and the next session of parliament we will have a general election, so that I cannot answer my hon. friend's question. I do not contemplate a general election, but there is always a possibility. The meeting of the House will depend entirely upon the circumstances that arise between now and the end of the year. If nothing exceptional takes place I hope it will be possible to have the House called together in January.

At 1 p.m. the sitting was suspended until 1.15 p.m. this day.

The House resumed at 1.15 p.m.

#### PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

##### FREE CONFERENCE WITH SENATE IN VIEW OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following message from the Senate:

Saturday, 19th July, 1924.

A message was received from the Senate acquainting this House that the Senate doth insist on its amendments to the Bill No. 255, an Act to amend the Pension Act, to which the House of Commons hath disagreed, for the following reasons:—

That the Royal Commission on Pensions and Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment was appointed in 1922 with a view to the government submitting legislation as an outcome of its report.

That the government did not present the bill to the Senate until it had announced prorogation in the House of Commons.

That upon a perusal of the Commons Hansard it was obvious that little or no discussion or consideration took place upon the bill.

That in the short time allowed, the Senate gave its best consideration to the bill and expressed the anticipation that the government next session would again submit it at an earlier stage for further consideration.

That the amendments having been so framed, no material loss will arise to the beneficiaries between now and the next session of parliament.

I might be allowed perhaps to make a little comment on what appears to be most unusual in this paragraph of the message, reading as follows: "That upon a perusal of the Commons Hansard," and so forth. Whosoever drafted this message apparently lost sight of the well-known custom and practice, which is to be found laid down in rule No. 203 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

Allusion to debates in the other House are out of order, and there are few orders more important than this for the conduct of debate and for observing courtesy between Houses. See May 289.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I entirely agree with Your Honour's comment, and from a desire to obey a corresponding obligation on the part of this House I refrain from making quotation. But Your Honour might have added that the government leader in the Senate similarly violated the rule by making a direct reference to the debate in this House in his speech before the Senate.

Mr. L. W. HUMPHREY (West Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, I feel I cannot let this opportunity pass without respectfully urging upon the government further action in reference to this communication with a view to a conference between the two Houses. I think the opportunity should be taken to lay the facts of this case before the Senate, and I would respectfully urge that a conference to that end be arranged. I feel the country would not approve of parliament's proroguing until every means had been exhausted to put this legislation into effect.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldier's Civil Re-establishment): Mr. Speaker, the reasons which are adduced by the honourable the Senate for having refused to consider thoroughly Bill No. 255, which was passed by