

would endeavour to proceed in some order, for the convenience of hon. members and of the ministers, too. Last year, you will remember, the three ministers sat here day after day. Questions were asked one minute with regard to air, another minute with regard to the navy, and another minute regarding the army. It meant that we could not have our officers here at any particular time, and we had to be prepared for almost anything, and I must admit that, so far as the army was concerned, I felt that the matter was not presented in the form which was most satisfactory either to the house or myself. This year I did hope that we would arrange in connection with the two billion dollar appropriation resolution to have one department taken at a time and exhaust the subject as nearly as possible, in the manner which would be adopted if departmental estimates were under consideration. That would apply to the minister of munitions also. If we have to get into a general discussion of the three departments in connection with the supplementary bill with regard to last year, and have to do it all over again on the new bill, we do not have the same order nor do we get an opportunity of presenting the matter in as logical and orderly a fashion as otherwise, and I do not think it would be as convenient for the members. If the citizens read the reports, it would not be as satisfactory to them either. My hon. friend suggested that I might make a statement at the moment. I do not see the need of making a statement on this resolution. I have heard two speeches, the speech delivered by my hon. friend, and the speech made by the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough, and certain suggestions have been made with regard to reserve units, home guards and some other matters. I shall deal with those at the proper time, but is there any hurry about dealing with them before Friday?

Mr. GREEN: Will the minister deal with them before the house adjourns on the 27th?

Mr. RALSTON: It depends what the questions are.

Mr. GREEN: The minister knows what suggestions have been made in the house in this debate and I want to know whether or not it will be possible for him or some other minister to deal with them before we adjourn on the 27th.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall endeavour to deal with matters that I think should be dealt with before the 27th. I say this with all due respect to my hon. friend, who made a very constructive speech indeed, that most of these things he spoke of are being dealt with in one shape or another. He talks about home guard; we

[Mr. Ralston.]

talk about coast guards. It is the same thing. If it is necessary that I make a statement with regard to a matter of that kind I shall be glad to do so, but I shall have to reserve the right to decide what I think is important enough to be dealt with at this time, particularly in view of the fact that we shall be coming back shortly to be engaged in a discussion in connection with the whole matter all over again.

Mr. GREEN: Will there be an opportunity for discussion to-morrow?

Mr. RALSTON: The Minister of Finance will answer that question.

Mr. ILSLEY: If the three ministers of defence make statements to-morrow I shall never get these interim supply bills through. I suggested a week ago that they should go through quickly by consent and that we could go into the two billion dollar bill and the ministers could make their statements, so that we could have an orderly discussion. The hon. member for Vancouver South would not agree to that course because he wanted to make a speech with the Speaker in the chair on this supplementary appropriation. I had no power to dissent from that. He made his speech and a great number of other speeches were made with the Speaker in the chair, and I had no power to prevent their being made, nor did I desire to prevent these speeches being made.

Mr. CASSELMAN: And they were all within the rules.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes. But I asked the house—and I gave ample notice—to have these important supplementary and interim measures go through parliament before the recess, and that means that they will have to be through before to-morrow night. I do not think my hon. friend can get the advantage of both courses of procedure which he is asking. He has insisted on making his speech with the Speaker in the chair, rather than follow my suggestion of putting these interim supplementary measures through by consent. If he had agreed to that course we could have gone on with the two billion dollar measure and the ministers could have made their statements and have been questioned if that were desired. But if the ministers are to make their statements on this, then we shall not get through. I am asking the house to let me get this through to-morrow night, and when the two billion dollar bill comes on such statements can be made as there is time in which to make them.

Mr. GREEN: Is it the intention of the Minister of Finance that his resolutions and bills shall go through by consent to-morrow

and following that, and for the rest of the sitting until we adjourn on Friday, the two billion dollar resolution will be under discussion with the house in committee of the whole? Is that the intention?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: Perhaps we could make some arrangement about one minister coming on at a time.

Mr. CHURCH: Why were these war items not given precedence by the Minister of Finance, instead of taking up grain and the plebiscite? War is primary; these others are domestic and secondary.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ILSLEY: The order to-morrow will be the \$135,000,000 bill, then the \$500,000,000 interim bill and then the supplementary estimates for the present year, then the interim supply for the coming year, being one-sixth of the main estimates for the year. They will be taken in that order.

Mr. GREEN: And then the two billion dollar resolution?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

It being twenty minutes after six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.