

Majesty's loyal opposition as opposed to the one hundred and seventy-five or so members over there, but let me point out to the Prime Minister that although we have only that membership in the House of Commons it does not represent the situation so far as the dominion and the electorate generally are concerned. The Prime Minister knows and the government knows that they have a mechanical majority behind them, a fictitious one at that.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: We have our rights the same as the Prime Minister and we want to be free to criticize where criticism is due and where it is in the national interest.

I think the Prime Minister knows there is no one more anxious than I—this applies to the opposition as well—to cooperate with the government in connection with war-time activities. We have done that on every measure. But in asking for cooperation the Prime Minister must not assume that we are going to surrender. We are not prepared to surrender, but we are going to cooperate and carry out our duties as an opposition as we think they should be carried out.

Having said this to the Prime Minister I do not want him on future occasions to rise in his place and place upon certain remarks certain interpretations which he knows should not be placed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that I hope when he speaks he will speak sufficiently clearly that it will not be possible for me to place upon his words an interpretation which it is not intended they should convey. I am quite prepared to leave it to *Hansard* to make clear whether or not I placed a false interpretation upon any words that he used to-night. I was very careful in listening to him and it was only the surprise that I experienced to-night as he went on speaking that caused me to feel it necessary to rise and take exception to what he was saying.

May I say something to my hon. friend which I hope he will not misunderstand. I have noticed that while he feels free to make criticisms of the government, he invariably seems to resent very strongly any exception we may take to those criticisms. He seems to feel that he has the full right to say what he likes and that on our part we have no right to take exception to what he says. I have noticed the tactics he adopts and I point them out to him so that he will not think I am wholly blind to the purpose of some of the things he says.

In replying to me to-night he referred to having touched "a sore spot" and he has also spoken about the government "bullying" the opposition. I leave it to hon. members to say whether any sore spot has been touched or whether there has been any bullying. The purpose underlying what my hon. friend says in this way has no reference to what takes place in this house. He is thinking of the headlines that will appear in his press tomorrow. We have seen, for example, references to the effect that the Prime Minister lost his temper. When my hon. friend opposite said that I had lost my temper I am sure the committee did not think that was what had happened. I will not say it was imagination or fiction on the part of my hon. friend, but I will say it was something intended to influence public opinion beyond the borders of this House of Commons.

I say this to-night because this evening he has again skilfully endeavoured to say a few things which he thinks may attract the attention of the country. I hope he will not feel that in anything I have said I have more than the wish to make perfectly clear the position of the ministry so that the true situation will be understood from now on.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, acting again as peacemaker I think I can summarize this little discussion by saying that both the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition have been at their best to-night. Now let us come to the resolution. This provides merely for a change in the name of a department. Will it be of any use? I have no objection to having any number of departments, provided each one serves the purpose it is intended to serve. If the veterans are receiving good service from the Department of Pensions and National Health, then I do not see any use in changing the name of the department. But if they are not, then it is not a question of changing the name, it is a question of changing the staff. That is where reforms are needed.

I have not made any speeches denouncing bureaucracy, but I must say that bureaucracy is at its worst in the Department of Pensions and National Health. The only pensions given are those that were granted a long time ago, and the cheques go out automatically from the Department of Finance to those veterans who were fortunate enough to secure pensions in the good old days prior to a general election. Now it is impossible to get any satisfaction from the department of pensions. I know whereof I speak because I am in contact with my electorate. What I say now I have said to the big bugs of the army not long ago. The county of Temiscouata has given more