

progress at the time of the adjournment on Friday. If we take a vote on this we will be prejudicing the motion of the hon. member for Haldimand.

Mr. SPEAKER: The position is this. A motion has been made that I leave the chair for the house to again resolve itself into committee of supply. I am now faced with an amendment to the effect that I do not leave the chair. If there is unanimous consent of the house that we go into supply, it automatically vacates the amendment.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would it not be possible to obtain unanimous agreement to go into committee of supply, without in any way prejudicing a full consideration of the amendment? Surely the house on a matter of procedure can do what it wishes, as long as there is unanimity concerning what is desired.

Mr. SPEAKER: The house can do what it wishes, but the difficulty is that if I leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of supply, I vacate that amendment and we revert to the original motion that I leave the chair.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And under those circumstances the amendment falls to the ground.

Mr. SPEAKER: Quite so.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We cannot allow that.

Mr. GARDINER: Could we not have unanimous agreement to postpone this debate?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I recall what took place when we adjourned on April 4. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), was leading the house at the time. I quote:

Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): What is the business on Monday?

Mr. Lapointe (Quebec East): I understand there is an agreement that this debate will proceed on Monday.

Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): I do not know of any agreement; the right hon. gentleman had better state his programme.

Mr. Lapointe (Quebec East): If not, we shall go into supply, and of course the motion of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn) will be taken up. There seems, however, to be a feeling that this debate should continue, and we are absolutely in agreement with that.

Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): That suggestion was made.

I know of no agreement, nor does my colleague.

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): I think perhaps this all started with my going across to the Minister of Agriculture, shortly before

we adjourned on Friday, and asking him whether this was not an occasion when, by unanimous consent of the house—the house being all-powerful in regard to its procedure—it might be well to go on with the wheat discussion in committee. When I made that suggestion I thought the minister was rather acquiescent; and certainly in neither of our minds did it supplant the motion to go into supply, to which an amendment has been moved. My understanding was that by unanimous consent this house could go into committee of supply, without prejudice to the main motion which stands in the name of the Minister of Finance, to which the hon. member for Haldimand has moved an amendment.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): There is no doubt that the leader of the opposition is right as to the rule. If you, Mr. Speaker, were to leave the chair and the house resolved itself into committee of supply and proceeded to discuss the wheat estimate, the amendment would disappear. But I submit that if the house agrees unanimously that the amendment should remain, or that it should be reinstated, it can be done. We are certainly masters of our own proceedings.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If an arrangement can be arrived at to have the motion and the amendment remain on the order paper, I am quite agreeable to going on to-day with a discussion of the wheat estimate. But I would not like to have the motion disappear upon an undertaking that it would be reinstated. There are many hon. members who want to talk about wheat. I am quite agreeable to this being done, but we do not want to lose our place. As a matter of fact we have been jockeyed out of position for about four weeks. We do not feel that we owe the government very much, having regard to their lack of consideration for this motion.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Reciprocity.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There is not enough reciprocity, and I say that in all good-will.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I were not trying to obtain a favour from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I might say something to him about the position into which we have been drawn as a consequence of this motion. I understand that if the hon. member for Haldimand will agree to withdraw his amendment on the understanding—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just a moment, please—that it would be understood that the motion would be restored immediately this