

are ready to speak, would there be any objection to allowing them to proceed? I should not expect my hon. friend to follow immediately. On the other hand there are hon. members who will wish to speak and who may be prepared to do so to-morrow. It might even assist other hon. members were we to have such further points of view presented, and were we to permit those to speak to-morrow who may be ready to proceed. I should think it would be preferable not to compel proceeding with the debate; but if any hon. members wish to speak following what I have to say could we not agree to allow them that opportunity? When we have reached the point where there are no further speakers to-morrow, we could go on to some other business.

Mr. GRAYDON: That means that we are back to where we were before. I am not suggesting that the Prime Minister has intended it to be this way, but in my view the suggested arrangement definitely means that those of us who would normally follow in the usual sequence of debate would have to be prepared to follow the Prime Minister. That is what I was hoping to avoid.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No; I would not ask my hon. friend to follow immediately after me. What I have said is this: it is hoped that this resolution might not be a matter of party controversy. I should think the whole discussion would be viewed as above party considerations; and for that reason, to save time and to expedite business, I have suggested that if there are others ready to speak after I have finished we might allow them to do so at once. Then my hon. friend might come in at whatever stage of the debate he wishes. I would not expect him to speak to-morrow.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think effect should be given to that suggestion. The Prime Minister will probably make to-morrow one of the most carefully considered statements he has ever made in this parliament on this very important question. I concur and I hope hon. members of this house will concur in his request that this will not become a matter of party politics, that it will be treated as a great international question above any party conflicts that may have developed between us in this country.

I would like to point out to the Prime Minister that we do not know yet what position his government is going to take. We do not know what principles he will enunciate from his place to-morrow. There certainly will not be time enough to permit hon. members to

study the government's position. Everything will depend upon the position which the Prime Minister and the administration take. For instance, I may believe in a policy of collective security while some other people may object to that. Before we can express an opinion on the basis of a bare, skeleton resolution we have to know what is the actual attitude of the government. It is not fair to ask private members or others to go on and deal immediately with the subject matter of a resolution of this magnitude and international character without time for study. I have not been able to assemble in my library all the material that has been put out since Dumbarton Oaks. These are serious matters which we should study and delve into and analyse in order to reach conclusions. I may have one view about one single circumstance and agree with the minister about all others, but I certainly am not prepared to go on to-morrow after he has made a statement which probably has taken days, if not weeks, to prepare with the whole secretariat which he has behind him studying this matter. It is not fair to a private member to compel him to do this. I think the proper course is for the Prime Minister to make his prepared statement and let us read it over.

May I close by expressing the hope that a matter fraught with such grave importance to the future of mankind will not become a political football.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, in listening to this discussion I am wondering just exactly what it is we are going to discuss after the Prime Minister's statement. It seems to me that the purpose of the debate which will be initiated by the Prime Minister is to obtain the feeling of this house regarding Canada's position on the very important matter which will be before us because of the invitation received.

Whether we agree or disagree with the Prime Minister we should be prepared to express our points of view as members of parliament in order that any delegation which goes from this house may understand what is the consensus here. To my mind it will not be a debate on what the Prime Minister may say to-morrow; we shall not necessarily be expressing agreement or disagreement with his remarks; it is rather an opportunity to express the opinion of this House of Commons on a very important matter, that of the basis proposed for the maintenance of peace. Personally I can see no reason why the Prime Minister should not make his statement to-morrow and then such members of the house as have been giving some study to these matters over a period of months or even years