

It is to formulate plans for the establishment of a system of regulation of armaments, and it is to submit those plans to all members.

In the third place, after those plans have been formulated they will be submitted again to the general assembly.

It is a vicious circle, but a vicious circle it will take a long time to go around. Then he goes on with an observation that may bring a smile to the faces of hon. members. He says:

It is not proposed this time that the United States or any other members of the new international organization shall disarm as an example.

No one wants to give an example. Who will start it?

It is proposed that all members of the Organization—

With a capital "O."

—shall travel the road together, and at the fastest possible joint pace.

All together, or nothing. Then he goes on to say:

No nation however is likely to travel either fast or far on this road until it feels able to place full reliance for its security on the international organization.

Now, what would happen is this: We all hope the enemy will soon be defeated. But after it will take a long time to adjust a peace which will last. And only when that has been done, the matter we are now discussing—the Organization with the capital "O"—will start to work. Therefore I submit in the first place that this debate is premature.

In the second place I follow the custom that has been established and express my views in the matter. However this is not the proper way to discuss a matter of such wide scope and with so many ramifications. Some leading members of all parties should be called together to discuss in committee the very important matter we are now debating. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has made a speech, as have the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) and the leaders of other groups. Some private members have also spoken. This does not mean that they have joined in a united front, because it is inevitable that there shall be some differences of opinion.

If a Canadian delegation is to go to San Francisco to attend the conference, then the Canadian delegates should be in accord; which is impossible unless they discuss the matter before we are finally called upon to vote upon it. Therefore I will ask the government to adjourn the debate for the time being, to form a committee to discuss the whole matter around a round table, so that we may know

more about the position that will be taken by the country at the conference, if we are to attend.

This brings me to the question of the extension of parliament. We have been told that all must show unity of purpose. I am showing good will and I am ready to go the limit in that matter; but I do not see how three billions of dollars can be swallowed in three weeks—rather I should say two weeks, because the present debate will continue probably into next week. If we go to a discussion of the estimates it will mean that we have not given enough time to the debate now before the house.

I hope there will be an understanding among all parties so that, in the first place, this matter may be studied by a special committee, second, by a committee of the whole house and, in the third place that it may be brought again before the house, sitting as it is now.

The life of this parliament will expire on April 17. We may be told, "Hurry up; hurry up; parliament will die, and afterwards it will be too late." Is that the way to talk to responsible members of parliament? We may be told, "Let us show unity of purpose; let us save the country; let us vote three billions in two weeks." That is what may be said. There are some jingoes who will wrap themselves in the union jack. If we do not agree with them we will be called traitors and bad citizens. We will be told that we are not faithful members of parliament when we are not ready to vote with closed eyes such huge sums of money. It will be said that we are unworthy to be members of parliament, and that is one more reason why parliament will not be revived by extending its term. This is the kind of speech we may hear, very probably, unless by general consent the life of parliament is prolonged. Why should it not be? Is there anybody who is going to play politics at this time about such an important matter? We should have been called in January and then much of our work would have been completed by now. However, we were not called until later and we have only a short time in which to study what has been submitted to us.

Neither the government nor the opposition should feel any false shame about coming down to brass tacks, about coming down to earth and seeing what can be done about an extension of parliament. There might be some criticism in some quarters, but the fact is that the government has the power to extend the life of parliament. It seems to me to be much more logical to extend the term of parliament so that we may give all or nearly all our time before the conference to a study of what has been said by Mr. Churchill, by Mr. Roosevelt,