

*Supply—Mr. Winkler*

which the Conservative party finds itself. Although there was some degree of understanding, we find ourselves in a position of prejudice. In cases of this kind, the members of this party are always willing to bend.

In so far as the rule changes are concerned, who in this house agreed more than the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) with those rule changes? There was no fuss and everything went smoothly. As a matter of fact, four or five of the suggestions that were adopted were suggestions made by the Leader of the Opposition. There were no complaints from this party. However, we find some manoeuvring taking place. We find the members of the Conservative party have been put in a position of prejudice. I find this is exactly the way the government operates across this country. They endeavour, with the assistance of their friends, to put us in a position of prejudice. Although the Liberals may sit there, they do not have the full reins of government. I may say that there was an increase in the membership of this party when it returned to the house. I feel these things are significant when we are determining what course to follow in this house.

In looking through the list of those who participated in the Throne Speech debate I find, that, with the exception of one day, we were in a position of prejudice in relation to our numerical position in this house. I feel this situation has to change. I say that to you, Mr. Speaker, with all deference to those people who sit to our left. There is not one of them whom I cannot call my friend. However, we have to be realistic. When they go out to the country and paint the picture black, when they tell the people of Canada they are being obstructed in the house by the Conservative party, they are being deceitful. Let us be honest, let us recognize the position of the members in the House of Commons. I grant you that we are all here as members of parliament, we all have our own position. We have our own people to represent and our views to put forward, and we have the legislation of the government with which to deal. Surely, however, it is not necessary to give the people of Canada a false impression of what happens in this chamber.

Were it not for the fact that the Liberal party will need the support of the splinter groups on a continuing basis, I am convinced that some of the things that have been said about the support the government receives cannot be blamed on the intestinal fortitude of the people in the official opposition. As a

[Mr. Winkler.]

matter of fact, I will mention the N.D.P. and the Ralliement Cr ditiste. They had the courage of their convictions and the intestinal fortitude to say they knew the government was wrong with regard to the subamendment and the amendment. This was not true of the Social Credit because they are the boys who are being wooed. Perhaps other terms are equally applicable. If this house is going to function, I think it is high time we were realistic. Those who desire to go over and join the government should do so and give them the majority they desire. Then, let us get on with the business of this house.

Certainly, the members of the Conservative party have deported themselves in a manner to indicate they are quite co-operative. They are in agreement to get along with the business of the house. We have adopted the same attitude with regard to the changing of the rules. We will honour those changes. Let us not be put in a position of prejudice.

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question?

**Mr. Winkler:** Yes.

**Mr. Patterson:** Would the hon. member not agree that the people of Canada have a right to elect whomsoever they will to be their representatives whether they be members of the Conservative party, the Liberal party, the N.D.P., Social Credit or the Ralliement? Would he not agree that the electors in any constituency have the right to choose their representative and have that representative present their case here in the House of Commons?

**Mr. Winkler:** Mr. Speaker, I thought I made that quite clear in the course of my remarks. I do not deny that. However, there are not five points of view on a question; there are two. When the government introduces legislation, you are either for it or against it. This is not true of that group.

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Listening to the whip of the Conservative party, I have come to the conclusion that I must be one of those who did not have the opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech debate, because of the large number of members in this house supporting our party. This being so, I am grateful that we have the opportunity on this occasion to say some of the things that we might have said, had it been possible to participate in what is sometimes regarded as the state-of-the-nation debate.