

refunding on a different basis in order to assure a fair and equitable plan, and if so, what were the terms of the offer?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The hon. member was good enough to give me notice of this question. The answer to his question is, yes. I had the opportunity of several discussions with Premier Manning before his plan was announced, and because I believed so strongly in the importance of a fair and equitable refunding plan, having in mind particularly the credit of Alberta and the other western provinces and, indeed, of all Canadian governments, I was prepared to recommend dominion cooperation in order to assure a fair and equitable plan. After my conferences with Mr. Manning I wrote him a letter outlining the recommendations I was prepared to make, and I now table this letter.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How did they receive the minister's overtures?

Mr. ILSLEY: They did not accept them.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE IN DEBATE ON RESOLUTION RESPECTING SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to make an observation with respect to the arrangements for the debate this afternoon. There is pretty widespread disapproval among the members of our party with respect to the proposals of the government for going ahead with the debate on the resolution this afternoon. There is no objection to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) making his statement, but there is serious objection to the debate proceeding, as was indicated yesterday afternoon, over the protests and objections which I attempted to make at that time. The feeling is, and I think there is plenty of evidence to support it, that while we are anxious to cooperate with the government, we do not think that the cooperation should be entirely a one-way-street cooperation. The government has, as the Prime Minister well knows, adjourned the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne and has brought on the San Francisco conference resolution in the name of the Prime Minister. We feel, and I think the Prime Minister will readily see the justice of the position we are taking, that when he has finished with his speech this afternoon an adjournment of the debate should take place to give us an opportunity to study and see the situation as the Prime

[Mr. G. H. Ross.]

Minister outlines the policy of the government. I ask the Prime Minister if he would have any objection to that. I took it from his remarks yesterday that he had not very much objection to it. Would he care to comment on that, with a view to arriving at some workable arrangement?

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): May I just say that the leader of the opposition is not speaking for the entire house in this regard.

Mr. GRAYDON: I did not claim to.

Mr. COLDWELL: I thought the hon. member said there was a pretty widespread feeling in all quarters of the house.

Mr. GRAYDON: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. CASSELMAN: We saw the cooperation yesterday.

Mr. COLDWELL: I wish to say that in view of the arrangements which I understood were made yesterday we are prepared to go ahead with the debate this afternoon, because we believe this is not a question of debating what the Prime Minister may say, but debating the very important basis of the proposals of the conference at San Francisco. We have been giving study to it for some weeks, and we are prepared to proceed with the debate. I want that clearly understood.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There was no arrangement entered into, there was a ukase set by the Prime Minister saying that he would go on, and if we were not ready to go on, why, that would be just too bad for us. This is such an important matter that I think hon. members should have time to study the Prime Minister's speech. I sent over to External Affairs to-day to see if I could get some data on the Dumbarton Oaks conference, but I was referred to what was tabled in the house yesterday. I have the memorandum in my pocket. There is a lot more material that private members should have, and it is not available to us. May I protest against the paucity of the material which hon. members are being given by the Department of External Affairs. So far as I am concerned I spent three hours to-day trying to prepare a speech on this matter and I have hardly got started. That is, of course, because of my stupidity and bad luck. This is an important matter. It is not something that should be rushed into by any hon. members of the house. We should have time to study what are the government's proposals. We know what is proposed by the three great powers and probably what they say will go; but make no mistake about it, we want to know what this government pro-