

Today the Prime Minister asks permission to withdraw—I do not believe he has yet received consent to do it—the last part of this notice of motion and to propose an entirely new motion with the last part of his notice of motion deleted. But he tells the house again that if we pass his motion, he will bring in a second one. Therefore he in effect is using a notice of motion given on Friday, and withdrawn, as notice of two motions today. In view of the difficult state of affairs throughout the world today, and in view of what you, Mr. Speaker, have said as to the critical situation facing Canada, I do not know how we can continue this debate and vote intelligently on the motion before us. Nor do I know how rules of order can be followed when a motion can be put in pursuance of a notice which is not specifically related to that motion. May we have enlightenment on that?

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I should like to say a few words on the motion that is before us. In my opinion it is a simple motion. As I see it, it does not take away any of the rights possessed by hon. members; it deals solely with the procedure for today. The motion has had the usual forty-eight hours notice; consequently the house is not taken by surprise. I do not see what we can lose by agreeing with it. After the motion is disposed of we shall have another one that determines the order of business for the following days. There may be some reason why we should disagree with the method to be followed there, but we have not yet reached that. We should wait until we reach it.

In his remarks the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) referred to the growing emergent condition in the country. I submit to hon. members to my right that we cannot deal with that emergency in a general debate on the speech from the throne. We can deal with it only if we face the questions before us and take action on them. That is the only way we can deal with them, and we cannot even reach them if the tactics of my hon. friends to the right are carried out. Perhaps it is good policy, but it is not good policy in my opinion.

An hon. MEMBER: You will soon find out.

An hon. MEMBER: Politics, not policy.

Mr. ROWE: It is getting closer all the time.

Mr. MacINNIS: We shall find it out when the crucial time comes. When that time comes we shall find out who is close and who is far apart. When any question comes up which affects big business in the country my hon.

[Mr. Boucher.]

friends to my right and my hon. friends across the way are as one. Do not talk about coming closer.

I notice that my hon. friends are following some screwball advice that they received from the *Ottawa Journal* the other day. In an editorial on December 5 the *Journal* said:

There has grown up of late a belief, almost a complex, that an opposition must eternally be concerned with "responsibility," . . .

Certainly the *Ottawa Journal* could not have been referring to the official opposition here. The editorial continues:

. . . that its sole job is to be "constructive." The belief is wrong. The job of an opposition is to raise hell with the government. If or when an opposition ceases to do that, when its members become obsessed with "responsibility," when they all want to become statesmen before their job of opposition is ended, then an opposition is in a bad way.

There is no danger of the opposition here ever becoming statesmen if they follow the tactics which they have followed today, and I tell the opposition here, and the *Ottawa Journal* as well, that any member who has not responsibility at this time has no business in this house. We must assume responsibility. I suggest therefore that we get down to the consideration of the issues that are before us. Let us have the question put to a vote, and then we shall be in a position, whether the motion carries or not, to proceed. I am sure hon. members wish to get on with the matters that concern the people of Canada at this time.

Mr. A. L. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I will not keep you for more than three or four minutes.

An hon. MEMBER: Too much.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I wish to put before the house the position in which I find myself, which is the position of many of us who have come here from quite a long distance. I think I can state that position without any lectures from the gentleman who comes from further than I do, and Canada might be infinitely better off if he stayed away. The position is this. We come here now after certain very important pronouncements have been made over the radio and in the newspapers. Normally the time a private member has to discuss the grievances of his people is on the speech from the throne, because there we are not limited. I expect, as soon as I can catch your eye, Mr. Speaker, to have something to say on the speech from the throne.

The difficulty is this. Several considerations are involved. By this procedure we are