

delay. Until we see the legislation, however, we are unable to tell whether or not this high national purpose will thereby be achieved. Let us have the bill forthwith.

Floor prices for agricultural products! The government in this, as in other matters, will be judged by its actions, not its promises. Not until the fifth year of war did fair treatment for agriculture occur to them. They let many agricultural prices remain at less than half what they are to-day for long periods after they came into power. What will the wheat growers, who got sixty cents a bushel or less for their wheat, and live stock men, who suffered equally, and dairy farmers, who were producing cheese and butter and milk and eggs far below the cost of production—what will all these think of a government which waited eight years to suggest a floor price, and then only after our party had proposed it? Nearly every agricultural commodity has, within the life of this government, sold at less than half of to-day's figure. Why no floor price till the government is threatened with defeat?

Our criticism of this government in these matters is that for eight years it has not brought forward enough progressive social or agriculture or labour legislation, and only now, in an election year, comes forward with these dying declarations.

Not as a challenge to the general principles of this overdue programme announced by the government in the speech from the throne but rather as a protest against certain grave omissions therein, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) the following amendment:

That the following words be added to the address in reply to the speech from the throne: "We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers have:

(a) Failed to make adequate provision and to implement promises already made for the immediate needs and employment of the men and women of the armed forces on demobilization;

(b) Failed to provide adequate measures whereby agriculture can make its maximum war- and peace-time contribution through a stable and effective long-term programme;

(c) Failed to establish such a national code for labour as will ensure maximum production and give to labour its rightful place in our national partnership; and failed to provide for the correction of the unfairly coercive and restrictive clauses in the 1943 wartime wages control order;

(d) Failed to lessen bureaucratic controls and regimentation and to recognize and restore the supremacy of parliament; and failed to halt the continuing infringement of provincial rights and the centralization of authority.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING
(Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my hon.

friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon), when he began to address the house this afternoon, craved its indulgence because, as he said, he intended to follow very closely the notes which he had before him. I must crave the indulgence of the house if I attempt to speak without any notes. To tell the truth I have not had time to write out a lengthy speech, nor have I had the good fortune of having others who would write it for me. What the house and the country will be particularly interested to know is whether the speech to which we have just listened is that of the hon. leader of the opposition, whom I see immediately opposite, or whether it is the speech of the leader of the Conservative party.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is the Prime Minister serious? I know he was indulging in a little humour at the beginning of his speech, and I do not want to answer him if it is one of those humorous quips of his; but I cannot imagine that he is serious in what he is saying. However, if he wants an answer to what he has said I shall be glad to give it to him. I made the speech myself, and any speech given in this house by me has been prepared by myself. I want the Prime Minister to accept that statement, because I do not want him or anyone else to make any insinuations with regard to any leader. I do not think it becomes the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am much obliged to my hon. friend for the statement he has just made, because I would repeat that what I think the people of Canada are interested in particularly, what hon. members are interested in, is not the views of my hon. friend or his qualifications for preparing orations, but the views of the leader of the Conservative party in this country. We have opposite a great party that over a year ago chose a new leader, and the country is anxious to know the views of that leader. It is anxious to have those views expressed in this parliament. May I say at once, since my hon. friend has brought the name of Mr. John Bracken into the debate this afternoon, and has spoken of John Bracken's bill of rights, of the Winnipeg convention at which John Bracken was elected, and much else connected with John Bracken, that I believe not only hon. members of this house but the people of Canada generally are anxious to see John Bracken in person, and if he is to continue as leader of his party to see him in this House of Commons.

Apart from all else, as the leader of this House of Commons, I have a certain obliga-