the escape clause without violating the principle of non-discrimination. Otherwise, why is the escape clause there?

Mr. ABBOTT: We do not want to violate it, but we do want to set an example. As I have said two or three times, the amount of business is negligible, whereas the benefits to be got from this restrictive program are tremendous.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Is there anything further to be said about the business on Friday? As I understood the Prime Minister, he said that, first of all, we would go on with Bill No. 3, and then he said the minister might wish to do something different.

Mr. ABBOTT: As the Prime Minister announced, we shall proceed tomorrow with the debate on the address. Due to an engage-

ment which I made a long time ago it will not be possible for me to be in the house on Friday. I had proposed speaking to the leaders of the parties tomorrow to see what arrangements we might make for business on that day. I shall be available tomorrow and Thursday to proceed with this bill, but I would assume that hon. members would want to continue with the previous arrangement for the debate on the address on Wednesday and Thursday.

Mr. KNOWLES: Why not switch Friday for Thursday?

Mr. ABBOTT: That would be absolutely satisfactory so far as I am concerned. I would be glad to proceed with the discussion of this bill on Thursday if that met with the wishes of all parties; but perhaps we had better leave that until tomorrow and either I or the whips could discuss that question.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.