

I sympathize with with him because he has to wear an additional garment in this period of hot weather. I have nothing to suggest for his comfort, but I have some suggestions which I shall make in English concerning the hon. members.

(Text):

Mr. Speaker, this business of calling parliament late in the year is getting to be a habit, and it is perfect nonsense. Let us get down to work early next year—and every year—and not have to sit here until late in the year. But this practice of calling parliament late has become well-known government policy; it has been the same since I have been in the House of Commons. It has been a policy of, "Put everything off; put everything off; keep putting everything off". I say that is not a real policy, at all.

When one asks what the government's policy is he is told, "Oh, we will give it to you in good time." But it is always the same old story—"Put it off; put it off".

Before saying a few words about the budget, I should like to make some other observations. At this time of the year, Mr. Speaker, it gets hot. I sympathize with you, sir; I sympathize with the clerk; I sympathize with the assistant clerk; I sympathize with the sergeant at arms—all of you with your regalia. The only one I do not sympathize with is the deputy speaker, because he has not got his regalia yet.

I know we wish to observe decorum in the House of Commons. I know we want to do that, by being decently dressed. But it is very hard these days to get ice cream suits; in fact, one cannot get them, although I see one across the floor. He is a pretty lucky man.

Why should members of the House of Commons suffer in weather like this? Why should we not be allowed to sit here in clean white shirts?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Pyjamas?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): We would all be better off. All this business of having to wear coats, and things like that, in the House of Commons, is all very well; we want to observe the decorum of the house. But I put this down, too, to lack of policy on the part of the government.

An hon. MEMBER: You cannot call it extravagance.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Custom is a funny thing. In the old days soldiers were not soldiers unless they wore red coats, and had their buttons shined. But the last war taught us something different. As a Progressive Con-

servative and, as a matter of fact, as a darned good Tory as well, I say that if we are going to have to put up with the vagaries of the party in power to-day, then certainly the least they can do for us would be to give some attention to the health and comfort of members in the house by letting us take our coats off.

I like to see hon. members properly dressed. Indeed, I recall when Charlie Dunning came to the house to give his budget he was always well dressed, wearing his morning coat and his pin-striped trousers. He looked well in them, too. I should like to follow his example, and be well dressed, too. We had great respect for him.

But times have changed. I noticed that when the present minister gave his budget speech he did not wear a morning coat or striped trousers, but just an ordinary business suit. And, after having looked at the budget and having seen what is in it, I think it would have been much more appropriate if the minister had worn his mourning suit—spelled "mourning".

I now address myself to the budget, and what I shall describe as a presentation for Canada. The author was the Right Hon. J. L. Ilesley, his assistants, the bureaucrats and the unrealistic brain-trusters. The name of his presentation is "The Government's Great Extravaganza. Continuous performance, at high cost to the taxpayers of Canada; come and be disillusioned!"

Mr. GRAYDON: No rain checks?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): What I think of this budget is that it is a budget of remote control, so remote from the people of Canada who are in business that it is removed entirely from all realistic business and all life.

Making these few observations in the budget debate my thoughts go back to 1945, in the spring of which year we had no budget. Individuals who were in business had to wait until the fall of that year before they knew where they stood. Certainly it was not for lack of asking for a budget. Of course we know why it was not brought down in the spring of 1945. There was an election in sight, and the government was simply scared to death to declare its position.

Again this year we began to wonder if we were going to have a budget. Again it was not for any lack of asking when it would be brought down. Finally, we waited until June 27 before it was received. Everybody knows that, so far as business is concerned, it is necessary to have the budget brought down in the early part of the year. But it is becoming a habit—I hope it does not become