

is open to him if he feels he has an obstreperous house and one with which he feels he cannot deal. He has his own words to guide him as spoken on February 1, 1958.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Would the hon. member permit a question at this point?

**Mr. Fisher:** I think the hon. gentleman would be much more interested after I have read the next part. I wish to draw the attention of the committee and the attention of the Prime Minister to another alternative which is open. This alternative can be found on page 3520 of the very same volume of *Hansard*. This debate took place on January 20, 1958. This is the leader of the official opposition speaking:

Needless to say, I hope the majority of hon. members will vote for this amendment and I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. St. Laurent):

"That all the words after the word 'that' be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

In view of the fact that in the seven months His Excellency's advisers have been in office Canada's total trade has ceased to expand, export markets have been threatened and proposals for freer trade have been rebuffed;

That investment has been discouraged and unemployment has risen drastically;

That farmers and other primary producers have been disillusioned and discouraged;

That relations with provincial governments have deteriorated into confusion;

That the budget is no longer in balance, revenues, are declining, expenditures are rising and parliament has been denied a national accounting;

That there is growing confusion about defence and security;

That day to day expedients have been substituted for firm and steady administration;

And in view of the desirability at this time of having a government pledged to implement Liberal policies;

His Excellency's advisers should in the opinion of this house submit their resignation forthwith."

I should like to suggest that here we have the second alternative for the Prime Minister to consider. He can take his own words used in January, 1958, or he can turn to that noble suggestion put forward by the leader of the official opposition on that fateful day, January 20. It seems to me that a decision in either of these respects would get him past the two difficulties about which he was fulfilling this afternoon.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Would the hon. member permit me to ask my question now?

**Mr. Fisher:** Now, yes.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** My question is this: does the hon. gentleman think the government has any more of a long term program now than it had then?

**Mr. Fisher:** I should like to say to the hon. member—and I am not prevaricating—that a vision is an intangible thing. But I think it

would be most unfair to read other than my own attitude and that of my own party into this and, frankly, we cannot see that long term plan.

So I would suggest that the Prime Minister has these two possibilities; he can dissolve parliament or he can respond to that grand suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition and resign and let the Leader of the Opposition take over. These are possibilities which are to be found in the records of their own statements. But I should like to add on behalf of this party a brief comment on one point which the Prime Minister brought up, which was that the western members, or the members from other distant points, tend to carry on the business of parliament while those from nearby do not. I think I agree that this is the case. I am always waiting for the day when some hon. members from the west, such as myself, can go home while the hon. members for Ottawa East and Hochelaga, and Russell, and others like them keep things going. However, I suppose this is really not practical, judging from past experience, and I suggest that members from the west and other distant parts of the country will always carry an inordinate burden until there is a different attitude not on the part of the House of Commons, but taken by the parties as expressed in their discipline.

On another point the Prime Minister made, I should like to suggest that the right hon. gentleman, when he talks about the British example, needs to put forward in much greater detail the advantages the British have with a unitary system of government, a simpler country to run and the kind of procedure which permits many more challenged debates.

This is the factor which I think is the most important one. In the British parliament the press, television and radio give a very skimpy coverage compared with our own country, and the fact is that most members of parliament there really do not speak with one eye on the press gallery or on the lobby for correspondents. The problem in Canada for members of parliament is different, particularly in terms of their own re-election and the role they must play. I have sat in the British house of commons very often, but I have never heard a constituency speech made in that house of the kind we hear here, where hon. members talk of having the constituency which produces the finest apples in Canada, or which has the most beautiful girls in Canada, or about the Kettle Valley railway and things like that.

But seriously, Mr. Chairman, on this particular point, if you are going to put forward the British model, you have to recognize the differences between us. For example, in