

Importance is attached to the new move to end Parliament as soon as possible by reason of the fact that prorogation would bring automatically a termination to the embarrassing investigation of the Public Accounts Committee, the special inquiry on soldiers' boots and other investigations which threaten further serious disclosures.

I do not think that the Government, either in this House or in the Public Accounts Committee, have given any evidence of a desire to prevent any matter from coming out that hon. gentlemen desired to be brought to the attention of the House and the country. I claim that the statement of the Globe is a very unfair representation of the facts, by reason of the fact that if the motion mentioned has been withdrawn it has been withdrawn at the request of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have only to say that if this motion was withdrawn at the request of gentlemen on this side of the House, I have no knowledge of it. The attitude of the Opposition this session has been to facilitate business as much as they possibly could; I think everybody will agree that we have had no other desire. For my part, I at one time indulged in the hope that it would be possible to close by Easter, and some time ago, when the Government proposed to take Mondays, I asked what business they had still to bring down. We were told what business they had to bring down, but since that day the Government has been continually bringing down new business of which we had no notice. To-day there is a new Bill on the Order Paper, to amend the Supreme Court Act. We were given no notice of that. The Estimates were brought down only last evening. If, under such circumstances, we are to sit from day to day I have no objection, but I think it would be preferable to have the usual Easter adjournment. If the Government desires otherwise, we on this side of the House are ready to go on.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I gave notice of my motion to the Clerk, and it appears in the Votes and Proceedings this morning. It is in accordance with what I stated two or three days ago, that we should ask the House to adjourn Thursday night and sit again on Saturday and on Monday in order to speed business through as quickly as possible. The Opposition have a perfect right to sufficient time in which to consider all measures that are brought down. Some new measures have been brought down which were rather unexpected, but I am

[Mr. Rogers.]

told they are not very serious, and I hope they will not take a very long time to discuss and dispose of. I am quite sure that the opinion which prevails on both sides of the House is that with the exception of Good Friday, we should stick to business until the business of the House is finished.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask if there are any more measures to be brought down by the Government, or is this the last?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There are no more measures to be brought down that I know of.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: "I know of" is rather elastic.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But of course one never knows what may happen.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am afraid that is true.

Mr. DOHERTY: The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has mentioned the Bill to amend the Supreme Court Act. Unless my memory is entirely at fault, when the right hon. gentleman asked the question as to what business might be expected, the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Robert Borden), on my reminding him of it, mentioned that there might possibly be a Bill to amend the Supreme Court Act. It is a very trifling amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think my hon. friend is right in that. But that was ten days ago, and the Bill now appears for the first time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS REPRESENTATION ACT AMENDMENT.

CORRECTION OF CLERICAL ERRORS.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), the House went into Committee on Bill No. 106, to amend the Representation Act, 1914—Sir Robert Borden; Mr. Seving in the Chair.

On section 1—Nipissing:

Mr. DOHERTY: As was explained when this Bill was introduced, its purpose is simply to correct certain errors in the description of some of the constituencies as set forth in the Act of last year providing for the redistribution. As I understand it, there are no substantial changes in any constituency. It is merely the correction of errors in description, and if I am correctly informed, the matter has been looked into by the committee that dealt