

as well abandon the performance of our duties if we are to yield to this sort of policy and to the reasons which are stated for our abdicating our functions as a deliberative body. This body is co-ordinate with the House of Commons. It has the same rights, it has the same duties, and its responsibilities are quite as great as those of the House of Commons; and to be told that because a Commission has reported upon this measure we must accept it, is one of the most humiliating statements ever made to this Senate by the responsible Government. I therefore move:

That a message be sent to the House of Commons to inform that honourable House that the Senate doth insist on its amendments to Bill 255, intituled An Act to amend the Pensions Act,* to which the House of Commons has disagreed.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: Honourable gentlemen, it is no secret, as far as my recollection goes, that last year, when this Royal Commission, which has been peddling the business along over a most inordinate period, made a report, the Government was not willing to accept the recommendations of the Commission and was overjoyed when this Chamber made certain amendments to the proposed legislation.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: That is only a surmise on the part of my honourable friend.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: Whether or not my honourable friend accepts what I say as correct, I have reason to believe that it is correct. Moreover, it is a fact well known to honourable members of this House and elsewhere that the adoption of the report of that Royal Commission last year would have involved this country in almost incalculable expenditures, which the Royal Commission never took into consideration at all. Furthermore when this Chamber made amendments to the legislation founded on the report of that Commission, those amendments were accepted throughout the country as satisfactory to the Government. Now, it seems to me to be asking this House to go a long distance to subordinate its own judgment to the advice of a Royal Commission whose recommendations the Government itself was not willing to accept last year, and the country did not accept and I do not believe the country will approve of their recommendations today. If these matters had come to this House with recommendations offered on their own merits, or setting out meritorious cases, honourable members of this House would, I am sure, have been willing to give them full consideration; but there is very little merit in that Royal Commission ex-

cept the merit of being able to make a great deal of money for themselves. In basing a statement to this House upon the Royal Commission's judgment—a judgment which has not the confidence of either the Government or the country—the Government is presenting a weak case indeed.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: It is worthy of observation, honourable gentlemen, that the Government's reason advanced in this case is not exactly consistent with its action in other matters. I would point out to my honourable friend the leader of the Government that a Royal Commission made an exhaustive inquiry recently as to the propriety or otherwise of the Government being saddled with the responsibility, or some of the responsibility, for the tremendous losses incurred by depositors in the Home Bank; that that Commission rendered a report; then a Parliamentary Committee in another place made a further investigation and submitted a report, which was unanimously adopted; yet the Government itself has not acted upon the recommendation of the Royal Commission, nor upon the recommendation of the Committee appointed to deal with the matter, and, after it has been declared by Parliament itself that the Government is morally responsible to the shareholders, and intimated that it should take steps to reimburse them, it takes no steps whatever. That being true, it is passing strange that it should advance the reason that has been given in this case for disagreeing with the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Before the motion is submitted, may I make a few observations which I omitted in moving it?

I recall, honourable gentlemen, that the Commissioners were appointed in 1922. My recollection is that they sat in 1922, and that during the greater part of the Session of 1923 they were present in Ottawa; and I know that during the present Session they have been in Ottawa, sitting as a Commission, not taking evidence, but preparing their report.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: They had made a provisional report. It was upon the provisional report that we worked last year.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I do not know what the distinction between a provisional report and an ordinary report would be, in a matter of this kind.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It did not cover the whole ground of their inquiry. They had done the first part of their work, and upon it

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED.