

Government Monetary Policy

economic planning will supersede unregulated private enterprise and competition, and in which genuine democratic self-government, based upon economic equality will be possible.

This is good:

No C.C.F. government will rest content until it has eradicated capitalism and put into operation the full program of socialized planning which will lead to the establishment in Canada of the Co-operative Commonwealth.

In the event, the C.C.F. party has not eradicated capitalism, capitalism in this country has eradicated socialism. The fact is that today in the labour unions people appreciate as never before that when management and capital harnessed properly together are making a profit, labour has a job and labour is earning salaries which make possible a higher standard of living. That is what is so contradictory about this resolution which was passed in 1933. But when they offered that policy to the Canadian people, we know the result. So they met again. They do meet from time to time. They met again in Winnipeg, in August, 1956, and they changed their ideas somewhat. This is what they passed at their last convention held in Winnipeg in August, 1956. I was not there, but they watered the resolution down:

The C.C.F. has always recognized public ownership as the most effective means of breaking the stranglehold of private monopolies on the life of the nation and of facilitating the planning necessary for economic security and advance.

This is refreshing:

At the same time, the C.C.F. also recognizes that in many fields there will be a need of private enterprise.

This is a complete contradiction of what they said in 1933. These socialists are now semi-capitalists. In fact, they are so capitalistic, Mr. Speaker, that when Mr. Fines made a million dollars as treasurer of Saskatchewan he went to live in a province under a Conservative government.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member, standing in his place in this house, said that because Mr. Fines was the finance minister of Saskatchewan—

Mr. Woolliams: I never said that.

Mr. Winch: —he made a million dollars. I say, sir,—

Mr. Graftey: The hon. member has it all fouled up.

Mr. Winch: Since the hon. member has made that statement about a former minister of finance of Saskatchewan, I ask him now to prove it or retract it.

Mr. Woolliams: I am very pleased to answer. I said this. After the provincial treasurer made a million dollars he then

[Mr. Woolliams.]

went to live in the province of Manitoba, under a Conservative government, where he could keep that money.

Mr. Winch: I rise on a point of order; I think it is a genuine one. Because the hon. member—I am sorry—the member, in all his talk has been making not a speech but—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rea): Order.

Mr. Winch: —a charge against a previous minister of finance of Saskatchewan that he as a C.C.F. member and as minister of finance made a million dollars, I ask that he produce these facts or retract immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rea): Nothing has been said about any member of the House of Commons here. The hon. member for Bow River.

Mr. Woolliams: I might say—

Mr. Winch: The man is a liar in what he said about the minister of finance of Saskatchewan.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rea): Order.

Mr. Graftey: Withdraw.

Mr. Winch: I will not withdraw unless the hon. member withdraws his charge.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rea): Order. We will wait for a moment until Mr. Speaker comes in.

Mr. Speaker: I am informed of a difficulty that has arisen in the course of debate. As I have it, the hon. member for Vancouver East, in referring to the hon. member for Bow River, used the words that "he is a liar"; and having been asked to modify, reconsider or withdraw that imputation, he has not yet done so.

The hon. member for Vancouver East is an old parliamentarian, and is familiar with the rules and practices of the house. From my experience, I know he has always been co-operative in matters of this kind. I express unhesitatingly my judgment as Speaker—and I have been entrusted with the responsibility by the house—that no hon. member should use such language in reference to another hon. member and if by any chance he does so, under whatever provocation may have compelled him to use those words, he should, on being advised by the Chair and out of respect for the authority of the Chair, do what he is asked to do regardless of what his feelings may be as a result of the provocation or regardless of the issues that may be involved between him and any other member of the house. What is involved here, what is at stake, is the capacity of this house to carry on its proceedings in an orderly and dignified way. The responsibility for seeing that that