

There are special reasons at the present time why a comparatively long adjournment should be granted. We are all aware that the Prime Minister has been out of the country practically from election day to the present time, and the government have not had the necessary time for preparation. The date suggested would suit me very well, but a great many hon. members on this side of the House consider that an earlier date would suit their convenience and the convenience of the House better than the date now suggested. May I ask my right hon. friend to consider whether he could not make the date a week earlier, say February 1, or better still the last week in January. I think either of those two days would probably suit the convenience of most members of the House better than the date he has now suggested.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government considered very carefully the point my hon. friend has just mentioned of endeavouring to suit the convenience of the members of the House by fixing as early a date as possible. We did think of asking the House to permit the adjournment until the 15th of February, but, on ascertaining the views of different members and conferring between the two sides of the House, we concluded that a week earlier than that would be preferable, and for that reason we have fixed the 8th of February. I ought to remind the House perhaps that there are a number of matters requiring the consideration of the government to which the government has had so far no opportunity to give consideration. All of this year has been taken up pretty much with matters of political discussion either in the House or outside of it. Many departmental matters which should receive the attention of the ministers have necessarily had to be left over until an opportune moment came for their consideration. The estimates for the coming year have to be prepared with care. It will take some little time for the ministers to determine finally the amounts to be placed in the estimates. We would like to have the estimates in readiness to be brought down as soon as parliament reassembles. It is not an easy matter, as hon. members opposite who have had experience will know, to decide on such matters as the estimates while parliament is actually in session. I would ask the House to show to the ministry that degree of consideration to which I think it is entitled at this time in allowing the extra week, which will mean a great deal to many of us in getting the sessional business in shape for the re-opening of parliament. I can assure the House that it will be the effort of the gov-

ernment just as soon as parliament reassembles to have all its business in readiness to go on with immediately.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I remind the House that we are through with the formalities attendant on the opening of the session, we are through with the debate on the address, and we will be at the point on February 8 that in previous years has not been reached until well on in February or March. So by reopening the session on February 8 we will really be very much in advance of what we have been for many years past at that period of the year. I would not ask the House to support the motion as introduced if I could not say honestly that we have given the matter very, very careful consideration and feel that in the public interest we should ask for an adjournment until that date.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY BILL

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, may I at this time ask unanimous consent of the House to proceed with the bill for supply so that once it is disposed of it may be sent over to the Senate?

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee of supply on Bill No. 3 for granting to His Majesty a certain sum of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1927, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2, \$64,590,350.74 granted for 1926-27.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Chairman, I understand that last night the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) agreed that any item upon which an explanation might be desired by members would be open for discussion so that the explanation might be given. I am sorry, however, to notice that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) is not present, as I should like to ask him why \$18,000 is provided for in the estimates for the movement of coal when only a shipment of 2,000 tons was moved. The share the federal government was to bear was one dollar per ton, or \$2,000 in all. Why the \$18,000 in the estimates, and what is going to happen to the balance?