

cussion. If we adopt this motion to have one day for the debate on the address in reply, it will never be finished.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is quite wrong when he says that there will be only one day. There will be one day for the leaders, and then an adjournment of the debate until a time when hon. members may debate the motion at length.

Mr. GRAYDON: I listened to the prime minister on a previous occasion some years ago when he took exactly the stand he is taking today with respect to the postponement of the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I will never again take his advice with respect to adjournment of a debate. I might conceivably take his advice on some other things, but not on such a motion as this. The result on that occasion was that it washed out altogether the address in reply to the speech from the throne. If the house adopts this motion, then that is practically the end—and the Prime Minister knows it—of all debate on the speech from the throne, having in mind our experience on an earlier occasion.

In so far as our position is concerned, the government is out of tune and out of joint with public opinion if it thinks that every member of the house has not had representations made to him, notwithstanding the fact that we have been here only a short time, that there be brought to the attention of the government the untold dissatisfaction with the matters which the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) has put to the house today.

The country is not going to be satisfied for one moment, whether the government knows it or not, with having parliament manacled and put into a strait-jacket so that it would have only one day to deal with all these matters. I do not think the Prime Minister can really have a clear conception of what the government proposes to do in this connection, or what the results of a motion of this kind would be, when he has moved to manacle parliament in the way he proposes at the present time.

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), may I as a member of this honourable house make one or two observations? I say to you and to the members of the house that whereas the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has put us in a strait-jacket as to what we shall do on this day and what we shall do on another day, that is not the essence of democracy, as I understand it. Every member who supports the government today, the Liberal

party, thinks he is an advocate of freedom. What freedom is there in a message of this kind from the Prime Minister? He puts Your Honour and members of the House of Commons into a strait-jacket as to what they shall say on this day and on the next day, and what they shall deal with. I say that is not fair to the people of Canada.

One thing particularly runs through my mind at the present time. What is there before the house now to take care of the problems facing the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie)? What opportunity is there for the house to discuss the veterans, the cost of living with which they are faced, and the difficulties they are in? There should be at least one opportunity during this session of parliament to calm down their fears and anxieties. I say to the minister through you, Mr. Speaker, that we should have an opportunity of discussing that matter, but no opportunity will be given if this discussion is to be shut off within twenty-four or forty-eight hours.

Taking a broad view of everything that is happening in this world I ask the house to consider where we are heading. There is no stability now. We do not know from day to day just what is going to take place. I shall give one example and with that I will sit down. I refer the house to the broadcast of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), which was followed by the broadcast of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott). I say that the Prime Minister knew what was in the mind of the Minister of Finance; he knew what the Minister of Finance was going to say. The Minister of Finance knew what was before the government and what the Prime Minister was going to say. To their amazement, the Canadian people listened to two different broadcasts. The Minister of Finance may chuckle, but this is a serious matter. Chuckling will not dismiss it. He knew and his chief knew what was going to be said by the other. This was the greatest example of facing both ways that we have had in Canada since confederation. These things cannot be lightly laughed off. They are serious; they are matters of great moment.

Before Canada declared war we assembled parliament, but we did not assemble parliament when a mid-session budget of great consequence was put on the statute book. I am in order in making that observation.

The people of Canada are disturbed. They are worried. They expect something from this extraordinary session of parliament which has been convened. There is a challenge to the Prime Minister and his cabinet to give