

millions of dollars voted without adequate review and reflection on the part of the Committee of Supply of the House. I know of no ground for that statement. I know it has been the practice—and in some degree that may have been followed this year—of having business done more expeditiously—and towards the end perhaps too expeditiously—than is done in the earlier part of the session. But if we are ever to have a session end in any reasonable time without recourse to such a practice, then it must inevitably follow that less time must be wasted in the earlier part of the session. The Government is not responsible for the fact that the House wasted many days in the consideration of subjects that really should not have engaged very much of its attention. It is not the Government's fault that that waste of time takes place. However, the fact is that it has taken place, and we have not very much more time this session to give due consideration to all the matters that are before Parliament. I do not think there ever was a session when the legislation and the Estimates were presented to the House at an earlier period than they were this session. That we find ourselves at this stage with a great deal of business still to be done is certainly not the fault of the Government. As to fixing a date to enable Parliament to close before I leave, I do not think it is reasonable to expect that I should—in a session like this particularly, it being my first session as the leader of the Government—leave prior to prorogation. It has never been my intention to do so; it is not my intention now. I do not think the country would expect that I should leave when the conduct of the business of Parliament requires me to stay.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I had not intended to say anything in regard to the remarks which have been made, but when my right hon. friend speaks of the time of Parliament being wasted, unless he is referring to what has occurred on his own side of the House, I would take very strong exception to his statement. Any discussion from this side of the House has been entirely to the point in regard to the various measures that have been under consideration. I would point also out to my right hon. friend that such legislation now on the Order Paper as amounts to anything has been introduced in the last couple of days. That is entirely the fault of the Government; we on this side have had nothing what-

ever to do with it. I would strongly urge, in regard to one or two measures—and certainly in regard to one that is liable to raise very far-reaching considerations, that my right hon. friend should consider between now and Monday if he could not let it stand over until next session. I have reference to the Lake of the Woods Bill. I think it would be wise to let it stand over. This would probably enable him to expedite his departure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There have been some Bills put on lately, there may be one or two more, but their late appearance is not our fault. I could not give a better instance than the Bill the hon. gentleman has referred to. That subject was dealt with by this Parliament early in this session, and fully disposed of on the basis of co-operation with the Government of Ontario, that Government having agreed to put a concurrent Bill through the Ontario Legislature. We performed our part of the agreement; they failed to perform theirs. That put back upon us towards the end of the session the choice of either letting the situation stand—under circumstances that I will be able to show to this House would not be to the advantage of the country, and which I am sure this House would not be willing to agree to—or to bring down further legislation. I am not saying that that is the fault of hon. gentlemen opposite, for there could not be any complaint in regard to the discussion on the measure which this House disposed of; but it is the result of circumstances over which we have no control, and consequently the matter must be dealt with before the close of this session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In regard to the point my right hon. friend mentions, I think I am correct in saying that the Bill which passed this House would never have been allowed to pass in that form except on the understanding that there was to be concurrent legislation by the Ontario House. It was distinctly on that understanding that we on this side concurred in allowing the Bill to pass. But, that concurrent legislation not having been passed by the Ontario Government, we were led to assume that would be the end of the matter, and I think we had the right to so assume.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know who led the hon. gentleman to assume that. We thought we could rely upon the statement that the Ontario House would pass con-