

matter? Will he permit us to ask some questions we want to ask and which he said yesterday we might ask? If that is not done, and I do not think the Prime Minister will take any different step, the result will be nothing less than steamroller methods.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What question does my hon. friend wish to ask?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Let us settle the general principle.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am not asking the question until the Speaker permits me to do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As between the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition there are always certain courtesies accorded. If my hon. friend has a question he wishes to ask me I shall be very glad if he will ask it.

Mr. GRAYDON: Do I understand that if I ask a question I shall not be deprived of my right to take part in the debate?

Mr. SPEAKER: As I interpret the rules of the house I would have to rule that the leader of the opposition would be taking part in the debate by asking a question, and would have exhausted his right to speak.

Mr. GRAYDON: If that is the case, all I can do is to protest and object. I think the country generally will not approve the manner in which we are being treated. I think everybody expected that there would be some kind of cooperation in connection with this resolution. We are objecting to the procedure to-day and we objected to it yesterday. Is the government reducing parliament to something that will be definitely under its thumb?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): It is deliberately sabotaging parliament.

Mr. MacINNIS: I believe we are losing sight of something that might help us to get clear on this matter. During the course of an ordinary debate it is sometimes customary for the hon. member who has the floor to give way to questions. The Prime Minister asked that he be not questioned during the course of his speech so that he would not have to give way. That implied that questions might be asked after he had finished, and I think he agreed with that. But the objection that has been taken is to hon. members making speeches while they are asking questions. I do not believe that an hon. member should lose his right to speak merely because he asks a question, but if he goes beyond asking a question, then he should lose his right to take

[Mr. Graydon.]

part in the debate that will follow. I think, Your Honour, that that is a matter that you can very well deal with. Do not let us get out of hand.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the Prime Minister a question by way of clarification?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member proposing to ask a question with respect to what the Prime Minister said in his statement? I have already stated what the position is. Unanimous consent has not been given, but even with unanimous consent I am in grave doubt as to whether the rules of the house should be set aside, even at the request of the Prime Minister.

Mr. GRAYDON: If that is the case, the situation is completely hopeless.

Mr. POULIOT: The leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) is much better when he acts as a ram than is the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) when he plays the lamb.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, if this matter is settled, I wish to say something. The business of this house is to be mainly a discussion of the estimates, the provision of money for the government, and the San Francisco conference which it is hoped will lay the foundation, as the Prime Minister said, of an organization which will guarantee something in the way of enduring peace.

May I say that I agree with those who feel that this house should have been called weeks ago so that we might have given adequate consideration to the problems that are going to arise. To try to crowd these into two or three weeks is an almost impossible thing to do. I feel that adequate time will not have been given for a discussion of the problems of war.

It was August that we last had the opportunity of discussing the ordinary business of the country, and to-day we are in March. Within two or three weeks parliament will be dissolved, and until some time late in the summer or in the autumn there will be no parliament in which hon. members may express the views of their constituents.

We are discussing now the San Francisco conference. We understand perfectly well that the united nations conference is in no sense, as the Prime Minister said this afternoon, a peace conference. As the resolution moved by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), which appears on the order paper, clearly implies, it is a conference to consider means of preventing future war.