

time to make their reports. Now, I say that it is a mistake to end the fiscal year on the 30th of June, the fiscal year should be made to conform with the calendar year. We now end the fiscal year in the middle of the most busy season of the year, which we break into two parts, and I believe it would be far better to have the reports end with the calendar year. If we did that, there would be no trouble at all in having a fall session, because there would be ample time to have those reports ready.

Mr. W. ROSS (South Ontario). Before this question is put I would like to say a few words in regard to the motion. So far as I am concerned, it would be practically impossible to attend a session of this parliament in November, unless I was compelled to do so. We have had the explanation of the Prime Minister of the reason why parliament was delayed this year, and we are all thoroughly satisfied with that. But I really think that the best time for parliament to meet is about the middle of January, that seems to suit every one, and we could get through the business of this House in about ninety days. That would let us out by the first of May, at any rate, and would give us ample time to do the business of the country. We should be called together in good season. I appreciate the difficulty of the western members and of the eastern members, that has been referred to. But after all, speaking from my own standpoint, it would be physically impossible for me to come here in November, therefore I wish to enter my protest against meeting at that season of the year.

Mr. BOYD. The motion I submitted to the House is not the same as the amendment of the hon. member for Elgin. I do not fix a date, I say on or about, whereas the hon. member for Elgin suggests a specific date. Now I ask whether any valid argument has been used here to-day against an earlier meeting of the House, or at least against a meeting in the fall. There is no denying the fact that henceforth, as this country keeps growing, it will be impossible to transact all the business in less than four months, or four and a half or five months. I have watched for some years past and during the years I have been here the last month of the session is all hurry and bustle and push business through when it should get a great deal more consideration and attention than some of the business that has been disposed of in the earlier part of the session. The hon. gentleman who last spoke says that the business of the House may be done in ninety days. I wish to tell him that it is impossible to do it in ninety days. This country is becoming entirely too large to think of doing its business in ninety days. I have given this matter very careful consideration. I have not brought it to the attention of the House thoughtlessly, but I have done it with the expectation that the business which this

House has to do will occupy four or five months. Such being the case, if the leader of the government is prepared to consider the business men of the country, the merchants and farmers and especially those who come from the extremities of the country, it will be necessary to call the House earlier, about the time I have suggested. In regard to the proposition of the hon. member that we should specify a date, the objection that I raised and which is one that appeals as I know to a great many members, will not be overcome because we will then be carried into spring.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, if I were to state my own personal view of the matter, I must say that I would very much prefer that the House should meet in November and December and then adjourn over until the first of March and sit during March and April. The two worst months in the year in this part of the country are January and February. Ottawa is very cold at that time and the travel in January and February is most dangerous in Ontario and Quebec at that period of the year. I can quite see that a fall session in November and December and a recess until March and April might suit the convenience of a very large number of our members. However, I think enough has come out of the debate to suggest to the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that he ought to be prepared, either now or at a later stage, to suggest that a special committee to be composed of the leader of the government, the leader of the Opposition, the Speaker, and perhaps other members of the House be appointed to consider if some practical rule cannot be laid down as to the suggestions made by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière). I am in favour of earlier sessions in the day as against these late sittings. I do not know what the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) says about the social gaieties interfering with the business of the House, but at any rate I can say that there has been great neglect of the public business after dinner time. There are often not more than ten or twenty members in this House after dinner. There are very few members of the government present sometimes and the public business is not being transacted as I think it ought to be. But, enough has come out of this discussion to suggest the appointment of a committee and I hope that if the right hon. leader of the government is not prepared to do so at the present moment, he will after consideration be in a position to suggest something in that direction.

Amendment (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) negatived.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House and with the approval of my seconder, I would beg to withdraw the re-