

Mr. GRAYDON: With regards to questions on the orders of the day, may I ask the Prime Minister if he will adopt a different attitude from that which has been adopted in the past? In the British House of Commons, as the Prime Minister knows, the first hour is given to the answering of questions orally and in writing. In one hour during which I watched the British house in operation eighty-two questions were answered, as well as supplementary questions arising from time to time. In this house we have gone to the opposite extreme. As a matter of fact I think the only criticism of this house is that we do not ask the government enough questions. The government get off far too easily in matters of this kind. I should not like the Prime Minister's words to be regarded as indicative of the policy which will be pursued from now on, because it is in the interests of the country that these questions be asked freely and that plenty of latitude be given. After all, that is how the people find out about the business of the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend the government is not objecting in any way to any number of questions. The point is as to the time at which and the manner in which questions should be asked and answered. Like my hon. friend, I have been in the British house and have followed its proceedings. My recollection of the questions being asked there is that all appear on the order paper and are answered by the ministers from the order paper, much as we do here. There is no limit to the number that may be asked, provided that they conform to the rules. It happens that in London there are likely to be very many more subjects touched upon during a question hour than there would be here. I would point out that the questions which are asked orally and which are expected to be answered orally are those which are asked as supplementary questions growing out of answers made to questions which are already on the order paper. They are not new subjects; that is the point I wish to make. The ministers are not expected to answer questions of which notice has not been given and which do not appear on the order paper, unless, as I have stated, they are questions arising from questions on the order paper or dealing with some matter of great urgency of which prior notice has been given to Mr. Speaker. Again may I say there is no desire to limit the number of questions but simply to have the questions asked and answered in a manner which will ensure accuracy and which will help expedite the business of the house.

THE SENATE

PROSPECTIVE TWO WEEKS' ADJOURNMENT— ASSIGNMENT OF ADDITIONAL WORK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I should like to call the attention of the government to the fact that those meeting in another place propose to adjourn tomorrow for two weeks. Will the Prime Minister kindly state if more work could not be assigned to the other place this session, in view of the large amount of legislation to be dealt with? I do not expect an answer today; it could stand as a notice for a reply next Monday.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I might as well reply at once to my hon. friend and say that an effort will be made to assign considerably more work to the other place to which he refers.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF ORDER IN COUNCIL 302

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour, a copy of which I have sent to him. It is for the purpose of getting clarification of what appears to be an ambiguity in P.C. 302. Paragraph 8, section 7, of P.C. 302 establishes penalties generally the same as in P.C. 402 of June 6, 1941, contained in section 5, subsection 2, but were applied only on the matter of union discrimination. Do the penalties provided in paragraph 8, section 7, of P.C. 302 apply only to discrimination by the employer for union activities, or do they apply to the whole of paragraphs 6 and 7 of P.C. 302?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): For the information of my hon. friend and the house, I should like to say that paragraph 8 of P.C. 302 covers exactly what was provided in subsection 2 of section 5 of P.C. 402. Does that answer my hon. friend?

Mr. GILLIS: It applies only in the matter of union discrimination?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes.

THREATENED STRIKE OF COAL MINERS IN NOVA SCOTIA—REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to make a report to the house on