

in seeing that these farmers are very properly assisted in their plight. In other words, let us not have once again here in *Hansard* words that a minister will speak as a private member and which he fails to back up when he becomes a minister of the crown. I would ask the minister in the days that lie ahead to come to the fore, to stand on his two feet in this house and say that he has the same degree of responsibility and the same degree of respect for these farmers—and sympathy, I might add—that he showed for the farmers of his own constituency before he became a minister of the crown.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Winkler: Yes, by all means.

Mr. Walker: What type of response did the hon. member get in this connection from the minister of agriculture of the provincial government?

Mr. Winkler: That is a very fair question, Mr. Speaker. I happen to be a federal member of parliament, and I consult the authority represented here to come to the aid of the people that I represent, in the fashion in which I believe they should. When I decide to be a member of the provincial legislature, I believe I will then be able to consult the provincial minister of agriculture.

I do not have the copy of *Hansard* immediately before me, Mr. Speaker, but the next matter I wish to bring to the notice of the house is the situation that existed at the beginning of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. One evening I found it necessary to rise—I might say rather hurriedly—to move a motion against the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) taking the floor. Had it been the hon. member for Villeneuve or the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) I would have acted in exactly the same way.

However, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Villeneuve saw fit to launch a personal attack against me that evening. This was totally unjustified. No French Canadian member of this House of Commons or from anywhere else in this country can say that I deny him the right to be a Canadian, or every right that he has to be a Canadian within the terms of our constitution. Therefore the words the hon. member for Villeneuve spoke that evening were entirely false, and nobody in this house knows better than he that what I say is true.

Supply—Mr. Winkler

It was mentioned this afternoon in the house that because the country has seen fit to return us as a house of minorities we should act in a certain way, and should contribute in a certain way. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, in all honesty, that I learned from listening to people in the last election campaign that there is only one thing wrong with this House of Commons, and that is the fact that there are five parties sitting here.

● (7:40 p.m.)

Nobody can deny that. What is more damning to the rules of this house, what is more damning to the efficiency of this house, what is more damning to the legislation of this house, than to have five parties sitting here? It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that when the government introduces measures there cannot be five points of view. You are either for them or you are against them. There cannot be four divisions of opinion against a subject.

Mind you, I recognize the need of the government to woo some of these people. I recognize the need of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), just as I recognized the need of Mackenzie King in 1926 to woo a little support for what is being done. Were I in his position, it may be that I would do precisely the same thing. I do believe that in so far as the dispatch of business and the orderly conduct of this house are concerned—perhaps the members of the press gallery have a degree of responsibility here—there is too much time absorbed by having all these people speak in a kind of official or semi-official way. This is one of the things that has caused a deterioration in the prestige of parliament in Canada. I think I am right when I say that.

The government today has moved in the direction of recognizing parties if certain criteria are met. Since that is the case, we must recognize the situation and we must act accordingly. This we have done. You will notice from the records of the house that I did not intervene when the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) took the floor. However, I did when the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) took the floor. The objection was a technical one. It was not a bicultural thing as the hon. member tried to imply. When the hon. member imputes motives to me and tries to indicate how I feel about Canada and Canadians, he is so totally wrong he only demonstrates his own ignorance. As I look over the list of speakers who participated in the Throne Speech debate, I am quite fascinated to see the position in