

ruling over Canada these last five years. The cup is filled to the brim. I have unceasingly protested against this curtailment of the members' privileges since the declaration of war and the adoption of the mobilization act.

What has become of the supremacy of parliament so dear to the Prime Minister? What has happened these last few years to the privileges of the house? All that has been ignored, dilapidated even. The day is not far away when that dictatorship will be crushed under the weight of public opinion. The Canadian voters are only waiting for the chance to speak freely on general election day.

I call the attention of the house to the fourth paragraph of "the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security." I shall read that paragraph which I find at page 12 of the pamphlet embodying these proposals:

Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade and other operations by air, sea or land forces of members of the organization.

We realize at once the importance and the seriousness of the engagements which the delegation to San Francisco might enter into on behalf of Canada. Our air, naval and land forces would be requisitioned at any time by the future league of nations to serve anywhere in the world. And we would empower the delegates to that conference to take such actions heavy with consequences or even to discuss their advisability? I say that this should not be done before a public expression of opinion. Parliament can not and should not appoint a delegation entrusted with such powers. I refuse to believe that Canada, once the war is over, should mobilize her resources for the protection of world security. I object to the sending of a delegation of members no longer in office to that conference; it would be contrary to our constitution, to custom, and to law. With many others, I wonder if it would not be more appropriate and reasonable to restore order in our own country, to stabilize our finances, and to prepare our youth for careers worthy of their sacrifice. In short, let us put an end to our international commitments. Let us undertake the rebuilding of our economic structure which is crumbling. Let us think first of our own, of the sons and daughters of Canada who will be returning to this country. They shall have the right to work and to positions worthy of their sacrifices. Up to now, the government has found twenty

[Mr. Lacombe.]

billions for war purposes. We shall need as much, and maybe more for works of peace. Peace and national security for Canada should be our greatest worries. To that noble task we should devote all our energy and our resources. Let us use them for our own people and for our country. I know that my call will not be heard. At least I shall have fulfilled my duty to my country and to my people. Those who, without a mandate from the Canadian people, will go to that conference and subscribe to new commitments shall assume before history the dangerous consequences of their acts.

On motion of Mr. Stirling the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. HANSON

PROCEDURE IN DEBATE ON RESOLUTION RESPECTING SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, when I rose yesterday at the conclusion of the Prime Minister's speech and asked the questions which I did, I based my position on a statement which I understood the Prime Minister had made in the early part of his speech, which I shall now read and which will be found in the second column, page 20 of yesterday's *Hansard*. This is what the Prime Minister said:

I hope that, in the course of reading this statement, I may not be interrupted—

And may I interject that that hope was fulfilled.

—but when the statement is concluded, if there are any questions in the minds of hon. members arising out of what I have said I shall be very glad to attempt to answer them.

It was on the basis of that statement, which is there without limitation, qualification or equivocation, that I asked the questions which I did. I hope therefore, in view of the discussion that ensued after the Prime Minister had spoken and I had asked those questions, that I shall not be debarred from the privilege of taking part in this debate if I so desire.

Mr. SPEAKER: In answer to the hon. member for York-Sunbury I was fully aware that he was under a misapprehension in regard to the procedure, and I intended—and I think