

the measure with respect to Newfoundland. We do not mean to adopt any dictatorial attitude.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** Hon. members can say "Oh, oh" all they like, but that is the fact. I know the intent of our desires just as well as hon. members who are saying "Oh, oh". I wish to meet in the greatest degree possible the convenience of all hon. members in the house. I do not want to start a debate today on the reasons for proceeding immediately with the Newfoundland measure; that will come on Friday. If we cannot arrange something that appears to be satisfactory to the majority of the members of the house, we will arrange something else. There is no intention of getting a snap decision of the house, but I do not think it would be appropriate for me to ask the house to make one order today and then come back on Friday and ask it to vary that order.

**Mr. Drew:** I have asked the Prime Minister to reconsider this, but since he has not done so I would point out that this motion does not produce the effect which he has indicated to the house. He says that this would have the effect of carrying on the debate; that unless there was another motion we would go on with the debate.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** Oh, no, I did not say that.

**Mr. Drew:** That was the impression I gained.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** I am sorry I did not express myself sufficiently clearly. I said that if we could not arrange to go on with the Newfoundland matter we would make some other arrangement for using the time of the house from Monday onward. I quite realize that some provision will have to be made on Friday for the business of the house during the days of next week and following.

**Mr. Drew:** I should like to continue what I was pointing out. The practice I have suggested is the accepted practice and *Hansard* will show clearly that the right hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Mackenzie King) on the last occasion, when he as Prime Minister presented a motion of a similar character, presented the motion that has always been presented to deal with the speech from the throne and give it precedence. On the very occasion when he did that he indicated that he would be introducing another motion which would have the effect of postponing the debate on a certain day. Therefore there is no inconsistency in presenting the usual

motion to give precedence to the debate, and to give on Friday, as the Prime Minister now has, notice of a motion, to be debated then, which, if carried by the house, would have the effect of postponing the debate.

This motion is not in the form in which a motion for debate on the speech from the throne has been put forward traditionally in this house. My understanding of the rule is that such a motion requires unanimous consent, or forty-eight hours' notice. I indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not consent to proceeding with this motion in its present form. I want to make quite sure that no suggestion can be made that we are blocking the debate on the speech from the throne. Therefore, if the Prime Minister will now introduce the motion that has been used regularly since confederation, we will support it and give unanimous consent.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The Prime Minister indicated that one of his aims was to avoid a debate on procedure today, but it must be apparent to him that he has made the very move which is likely to produce a prolonged debate. Yet I suggest it is still possible to avoid a procedural debate today if he will accept the suggestion made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) and the leader of this group. All he has to do is to withdraw the motion he has made and make the motion that has been made on almost every occasion, namely, that the debate on the address begin tomorrow and have precedence until it is concluded. As the leader of the opposition has said, he can then give notice that on Friday it is his intention to move a motion to the effect that notwithstanding the order of January 26 such and such shall be the case. I would point out that not only was this done in that manner last year, but in many sessions the debate on the address has proceeded for a considerable period of time and has then been interrupted by a subsequent motion. I would suggest that the Prime Minister should make the usual motion. If he will accept that suggestion he will avoid a debate today.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** I think the hon. member is making a mistake. The motion that was made was that the debate on the address have precedence for one day and that on the following Monday measures arising out of the emergency legislation—

**Mr. Knowles:** On a point of order, that was interpreted to go on and on, indefinitely.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** Yes, but the motion that was made was not that the debate on the address have precedence until concluded. It was that it have precedence only over the Monday following the opening of parliament,