

I see no reason why we could not sit here while his majesty is in other parts of Canada. This fear of doing something while his majesty is here savours of provincialism in the extreme. There is no curtailment of debate in the imperial parliament when his majesty is in England, or when he is in London, where he usually resides. His majesty, we are told, is king of Canada as well as king of Great Britain. Why, then, should we curtail our discussions in the house because our king happens to be in Canada? I agree the proper thing to do is to proceed with our business in the ordinary way. When his majesty leaves for the west we can resume business here, regardless of whether or not the Prime Minister is in attendance in the chamber. He has very capable lieutenants who, I believe, could lead the house in his absence.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, my particular group have no objection to sitting on Saturday, or to spending extra time on the business of the country any other day. Above all things we do desire that there should be adequate discussion, and that so far as is humanly possible we should arrive at constructive and effective decisions, particularly regarding agriculture, unemployment and finance.

We are ready to cooperate with the government and other members of parliament as far as seems wise and becoming. Therefore we are inclined to allow the government to lead while we walk along by their side, so to speak, in the matter of conducting the sittings. We are disposed to think that a short adjournment of seven or eight days would be advisable, provided it were not possible to finish our business before their majesties arrive. With respect to the possibility of finishing, may I say that we are too inexperienced in parliamentary matters to be in a position to forecast whether or not it could be done. It looks to me impracticable, having in mind the manner in which I have seen some things done. However I am not adverse to trying.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should first remind hon. members that the motion before us at the moment is in relation to the house sitting to-morrow. It is not whether or not we, at the time of their majesties' visit, will adjourn for a few days, or adjourn until after their majesties' visit, but whether we will sit to-morrow morning and afternoon.

In the first place may I say, in regard to the motion, that were it not that Sunday is the day following, I should not have thought

[Mr. MacInnis.]

of presenting it. I can assure the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) that I am as desirous as he is to see that Sunday is duly observed, although I regret it is not always possible to observe it the way one would like to. But certainly as a day of rest I hope on this occasion we shall all be able to observe it as such.

I agree with what the hon. member has said about the stress and strain of public life. I think I perhaps have more reason to know about what is involved in that particular than any other member of the house. And while we are speaking of that, may I say to my hon. friend that the fact I have not been continuously in my seat for the past week is not evidence that my time has not been exclusively taken up with public business.

Mr. COLDWELL: No one has suggested that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But the comment goes out to the country as such. May I say that last fall I was obliged to take a short rest on account of the condition of my health at the time. That rest was concluded at the end of October, I think it was, and from that time until this—not excepting Sundays—there is no day in which I have not given most of my time, in fact practically all of my time, to the work of the government of this country.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If the Prime Minister would permit me to say so, there was no such thought in my mind. My point was simply this, that if we had worked here during the Prime Minister's absence for the last week, we might manage to do so for the next week or so. But I have no doubt the Prime Minister has been exceedingly busy.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The fact the hon. member and other hon. members feel the house will not suffer from my absence is one of the reasons which perhaps caused me to be a little less in the house during the last week or two than otherwise I would have been. I perhaps might remind the hon. member that most of the measures, certainly all of the government measures, which are before the house have been fully discussed in cabinet. With very few exceptions I have been present at all meetings of the cabinet, and have participated in discussions of these matters. I know what the position of the government is to be, and I have felt it perfectly safe to leave in the hands of the minister in charge of a government bill the statement to the house, and to leave to my colleagues the debate on measures of that kind. I do not