

inability of both sides to come to agreement on matters of procedure, I think a much better way would be for the government itself to decide upon the course it thinks in the public interest.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) has spent a considerable time this year asking us to call an early session of parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Why didn't you?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We have it now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Some of my young friends opposite seem over keen to be talking on this and talking on that, regardless of its importance. May I say to them that if they had been in this parliament as long as I have they would realize that the calling of a session at this time of year is quite exceptional, and has not, as a normal procedure, been done for a long while past. We are now seeking to meet hon. gentlemen opposite, and about all we get from them at the moment are some of the jeers we have heard. May I say, Mr. Speaker, we have called this session at this time rather than later on, as has been customary, because there are important matters which we feel should be placed at the beginning of the session before the country in their true light. We intend to follow the procedure I have suggested, unless the house decides, in a vote on the motion, that this procedure is not to be followed. May I say a further word to my hon. friend. Every one of the matters that he discussed this afternoon I indicated could come up for discussion next week.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg pardon. On the matter of the Geneva agreement many questions can be discussed. There is a day fixed for the emergency exchange measures. There is a day fixed for the interim extension of the transitional measures. I have not indicated that the day suggested would be the only day on which debate would take place on the subject set forth. I have tried to make it clear that the government is seeking to place before parliament and the country the different important measures that will require extensive debate, but that because they require extensive debate we wish to have a beginning made without delay, so that the country will get a true perspective of the several matters.

Mr. BRACKEN: If the Prime Minister will permit one question, I understand that, if

this motion passes, the government will determine the procedure regardless of private members' days or anything else?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: And that the government is disposed to follow the procedure outlined in the Prime Minister's opening remarks, which would mean one day only for the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne and then two days for the debate on the Geneva agreements. My question is this. Would the Prime Minister consider postponing the debate on the Geneva agreements and giving us those two days to continue the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne? I think he would get something like agreement if he would do that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My thought in connection with my hon. friend's suggestion would be that if we continued the debate on the address beyond the point of having only the leaders speak, we would come at once to the question of who, as among the private members, was to have the right to continue on the following day. With every private member of this house having as much right to consideration as every other member, a debate limited to one further day for private members could give rise to all kinds of ill feeling. It would be impossible for Mr. Speaker or anyone else to decide who, among the private members, should have the privilege of speaking in the debate on that one particular day.

Mr. GRAYDON: Then I should like to ask another question. If that remark applies to the debate on the address would it not apply with equal force to the private members who may wish to take part in the debate on the Geneva agreements?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In connection with the Geneva agreements an opportunity for discussion is provided the leaders. That discussion, I think, will be quite different from the discussion that will take place on some of these other measures. The two days were allotted to that debate simply to comply with a suggestion which came from some hon. gentlemen opposite. As far as the government is concerned, we would rather have one day and then get on with the discussion of the emergency exchange measures.

When my hon. friend speaks of one day for the debate on the address, he knows, once the debate on the address is started, unless it is definitely restricted it may run on for a month. By the proposal made we are not taking away the right of hon. members to