

with some of that spirit of unity for a common purpose that our fighting men are showing on the other side.

I take second place to no one, not even the leader of the opposition, in my thorough distaste of the policies of the Liberal government. I take second place to no one in my determination to do everything I can to defeat them at the next election. I am sick and tired of the myth that there is only one man in this country who can be the prime minister of Canada. I wish to say, despite the fact that it may embarrass my leader who is sitting in front of me, that there is one other man in this country who really can lead us as prime minister—the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell).

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Well, well, well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. KNOWLES: The country is fully aware of the fact that unless this party provides an alternative to the present Prime Minister, certainly no other party is going to provide one. I do not see the Progressive Conservatives offering an alternative for that position in whom the people of Canada can place any confidence whatsoever.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): There are a lot of things you have not seen yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. KNOWLES: I wish to say that the leader of the opposition need not worry as to our attitude toward the present government, or toward the Liberal party; but that does not deflect us from realizing that at the present time everything possible should be done to bring to an end the arousing of the country and the inflaming of sectional interests and prejudices. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say quite frankly we feel that in the government's readiness to accept the amendment we have moved at this last moment we have won, not just for this group but for this parliament and for the people of Canada, a victory over the crisis through which we have passed. We feel that the amendment should be adopted and the motion in the amended form should be carried by this house.

Mr. L. PHILIPPE PICARD (Bellechasse): The proceedings of this house during the last three weeks would remind one of a game of hockey or a game of hide-and-seek. People have been trying to find the puck and are wondering where it has gone. We have been trying to find the issue and to-night we are wondering where it has gone. The government has accepted the C.C.F. amendment.

Why? When the government summoned parliament to Ottawa it had for its purpose the approval of its policy. To-night at the last moment we see the government changing and accepting the suggestion of the C.C.F. party to take all the sense out of its motion. If we leave these three words out of this motion it becomes exactly similar to the subamendment I proposed earlier in the debate, according to the words of Mr. Speaker. At that time Mr. Speaker said:

The amendment is not complete in its form. It is the expression of a general opinion which may be moved in any public body but has no connection with the business of the house.

The object of the house is to suggest, approve or disapprove of the government's policy.

If we leave these three words out where are we? Where is the government's policy? In 1942, when bill 80 was passed, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) told the house that if at any time he implemented the provisions of that bill he would come to the house and ask for a vote of confidence. What we have before the house to-night is or is not a motion of confidence. If it is a motion of confidence these three words have to stay in it. If the government accepts the amendment of the C.C.F. party, it is not a motion of confidence; it is just a literary effort and it does not concern at all the approving or disapproving of the government's policy. Withdrawing of the three words at the last moment will not change the feelings of the people at the present time. I am not to speak for those who feel that the government in its programme has not done everything it should have done, but I am to speak for myself, believing that the policy of the government as it stood on the day its motion was presented included the approval of the principle of bill 80 and the approval of order in council 8891. The deleting of three words to-night have not changed the sense of the government's policy. The withdrawing of three words will not withdraw one of the men who are on their way overseas by reason of order in council 8891. I cannot understand how the government at a moment like this, of such seriousness in the history of the country, can accept the taking of all sense from the motion, because, as it stands now, the motion simply reads that we are approving or aiding the government in maintaining a vigorous war effort. I support the stand taken by the hon. member for Richelieu-Verchères (Mr. Cardin) when he said: "Can the government maintain a war effort without a policy?" The policy that the government called us to Ottawa to approve included those three words. What is it now?