



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



I N D E X

Monday Evening, August 3, 1959

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Committee Report, Law Amendments (Mr. Lyon)</u>	1511
<u>Bills 96, 102, 103, 104, 105: Third Reading</u>	1512
<u>Adjourned Debate, re Permanent Speaker: Mr. Campbell</u>	1512
Mr. Roblin	1515
Division on amendment	1517
Mr. Paulley	1517
<u>Speeches in French, Mr. Desjardins, Mr. Roblin</u>	1518

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:00 o'clock, P. M. Monday, August 3rd, 1959

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

HON. STERLING LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Ninth Report of the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: The Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their Ninth Report. Your Committee has considered Bills No. 102, an Act to amend the Agricultural Credit Act; No. 103, an Act to amend the Mines Act; No. 104, an Act to amend the Real Estate Agents Act; No. 105, an Act to amend an act to incorporate the Sisters of the Order of St. Benedict, and has agreed to report the same without amendments. Your Committee has also considered Bill No. 96, an Act to facilitate the Development and Transmission of Water Supplies for the Domestic Use of the People of the Province and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, all of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the report of the Committee be received.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion
Introduction of Bills
Orders of the Day

Mr. Desjardins (St. Boniface), spoke in French. This will appear on page 1518 of Hansard.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): . . . All of us, I am sure, have been very pleased with Her Majesty's excellent choice for the next Governor-General. I wish to congratulate the Federal authorities for recommending such a man. Major General George Vanier represents the ideal Canadian, perfectly bi-lingual, lawyer, soldier, diplomat, and above all, true patriot. He comes from an old Canadian family, proud of his French heritage and his religion, he always remains a true Canadian. He has no patience with fanatics, even those of his own province. A much-decorated soldier, he encourages French compatriots to join the armed forces and fight for their country. A man such as this will without a doubt help all Canadians to know and understand each other better, and this in itself would be a great service for our country. God Bless our new Governor-General, and to Honourable Mr. Massey, I say, Thank you for a job well done!

Hon. Duff Roblin (Premier) (Wolseley), spoke in French. This will also appear on page 1518.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I am sure we all join with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface who has just spoken in expressing our gratification at Her Majesty's selection of Major-General Vanier as the next Governor-General of the country, and I know that we are happy to join with the expressions just offered by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

Mr. Speaker, the Order Paper has one item on it, namely the debate on the Speakership, but I suggest, Sir, that if it meets the wishes of the House that we would proceed to the Committee of the Whole stage on the bills that have just been through the Law Amendments Committee, and if there is no objection from the other side I would propose that to you, Sir.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following Bills: No. 96, an Act to facilitate the Development and Transmission of Water Supplies for the Domestic Use of the People of the Province, standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture; No. 102, an Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act, standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture; No. 103, an Act to amend the Mines Act, standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources; No. 104, an Act to amend the Real Estate Agents Act, standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities;

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) No. 105, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Sisters of the Order of St. Benedict, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. The House resolves itself into a Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews took the Chair.

Bill No. 96 was read section by section and passed. Bill No. 102 was read section by section and passed. Bill No. 103 was read section by section and passed. Bill No. 104 was read section by section and passed. Bill No. 105 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Coats please. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered certain bills and directed me to report as follows: No. 96, 102, 103, 104, 105 without amendments, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre the report of the Committee be received.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Bills Nos. 96, 102, 103, 104 and 105 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Brandon. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, it will surprise no one I think to hear that I've been getting a good bit of friendly advice on this side of the House, and by messenger from the other side of the House, suggesting that I do not take as long to develop this theme as I have on some other occasions. I would very gladly accede to those requests and shall do my very best indeed to cut down my speaking time to the absolute minimum, but I simply must emphasize once again how important I believe this subject to be, and so I just must take a little bit of time in order to briefly refer to the remarks of those - some of those, at least - who have spoken on the amendment. I had thought of dealing with a couple of newspaper editorials as well, but in the interests of brevity I think I shall leave those out, because I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that some more of the honourable members would have shown a greater interest in this subject, and I confess that I am disappointed in that I have not been successful in getting the honourable members of the House who have spoken so far, to appear to grasp the point that I am trying to make in this debate. As evidence of that I should mention briefly the remarks of the Honourable Member for Brandon - I am sorry that he is not in his seat, so that will allow me to spend less time there than I otherwise would. The Honourable Member for Brandon, page 1058 of Hansard, suggest that there is an implication in this motion that the office of Speaker in this Legislature is not conducted in an impartial manner.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no such implication at all so far as I am concerned. The Honourable Member for Brandon goes on to say, "Now I suppose the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would suggest that the main point of his argument lies in his reference to a non-partisan approach to insure complete independence." Now this again on the surface looks pretty good, but I would suggest to you that it can only be good in case of complete agreement always, and that not always can there be complete agreement. When there's disagreement then someone must take the responsibility of selecting, nominating a Speaker - of nominating, I mean deciding. And that responsibility must devolved upon the government. Mr. Speaker, that is quite correct. I have never, never suggested anything but that. If I could just once get my point accepted by the House. It is simply this; that we recognize that in the absence of agreement then of course the government would have to take action in the matter and the government with a majority would be in a position to carry its decision.

The whole point of my remarks is that the understanding that was arrived at in the 24th Legislature was that we would attempt a nonpartisan approach by getting the leaders, their causes, to at least try to agree upon the nominee and when the newspapers editorials -- and I shall not take the time to read them -- Tribune editorials in both cases, suggested that this required unanimous consent. Nothing of the kind, Mr. Speaker. Unanimous consent would perhaps, as the Honourable Member for Brandon says, not always be forthcoming, but if at least it were attempted by getting the Leaders of the different groups together in order to discuss the nomination rather than calling them in as was done to simply OK a decision that had already been

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . made. That's the whole point of this debate. And, of course, if it's impossible for them to agree, then naturally the government has to take the initiative and proceed to nominate Mr. Speaker. And then the Honourable Member for Brandon goes on to say that "now then the Leader of the Opposition made reference to some sort of fictitious constituency, and this same editorial -- one of these that he was quoting -- points out that the British parliament several years ago considered and rejected the idea advanced by Mr. Campbell that the Speaker should represent some kind of a special constituency. Political scientists are wary of this scheme; if the Speaker does not represent an ordinary constituency he stands in the danger of becoming a glorified civil servant. At the worst the Speakership could turn into a political plum with which the government could award its friends."

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it might seem presumptuous for a young parliament like ours to say that we were going to improve on the old country system, but that's exactly what we were presumptuous enough to believe here a year and a half ago when we talked this situation over and we decided here. The leaders of the two groups and I in the first case after a lot of consultations that I had had with my friends who I believe to be experts on this matter, who were studying it along with me and on my behalf, we believed that there were some weaknesses, as the editorial in the Tribune has suggested, because the Tribune editorial went on to say that it hasn't always worked out this way. Of course it hasn't, and we were trying to improve on that situation. We were trying to find a way by which we could give greater security of tenure to the incumbent of Mr. Speaker's Chair, and one of the reasons, one of the things that we thought would do that was that if instead of Mr. Speaker being chosen on a unilateral basis as the Tribune editorial points out is usually the case in the United Kingdom, if instead of being done that way, that he were chosen if possible by a nonpartisan approach of all the groups getting together in the choice, then that he would start off with a greater likelihood of continuing in that position and would not run the risk - the same risk that they do over there of being opposed because of the nonpartisan approach.

And then during those discussions, and I confess that this other point was not fully discussed between the other two leaders and myself, but it was discussed at considerable length with the experts who were conferring with me on this subject. And I think I mentioned before that they were high ranking gentlemen of the University of Manitoba and a couple of others. It was one of the things that is pointed out in the authorities on this matter, and that was emphasized by these gentlemen, was that in the modern era particularly it has become difficult to carry forward this idea of non-opposition to Mr. Speaker because of the fact not only the disenfranchisement of the constituency which many of the authorities refer to, and pay a good bit of attention to, but the other idea that was mentioned in a quotation that I read the other day to the House, that the organization -- the political organization -- is inclined to look with disfavour upon the continuing to give an acclamation to the Speaker because it weakens the organizational setup. And so considering those two points we had decided that it was well worth while to at least mention to the House this suggestion of a special constituency, and the United Kingdom committee that looked at this, Mr. Speaker, so far as I have been able to find out, did not come up with the kind of concrete suggestion that we did with regard to an "actual" constituency. Always it was a fictitious constituency as far as they were concerned. We suggested that it was worth looking at an actual constituency where the members of the House would be the only electors. Mr. Speaker, what opportunity would there be for difficulty in that case if the control of the situation so far as Mr. Speaker is concerned, was always left to the members of the House. Well, I'm not going to develop that at any greater length at this time because that matter was raised for discussion only. It was discussed - I mentioned it to the two leaders and I mentioned it again in the House just so it would be before the members when they were considering this whole matter; but never with the idea that it would be incorporated in our practice immediately. Simply as one of the things that we could think about and talk about and work toward in the long period, or as soon as the House decided to do it. I mentioned as well, when this matter was before the House a year ago last winter, that all that we were proposing to do was to have the two bills passed at that time and then the choice of Mr. Speaker - we hoped under the new arrangement - would be made when the new House assembled - and changed circumstances, of course, intervened as I mentioned earlier on. My whole complaint is the fact that the Honourable the First Minister did not carry through with the understanding which was arrived at, which

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . understanding was that there would be discussion of the selection of Mr. Speaker by the leaders of the different political parties, So when the Honourable Member for Brandon goes on to say - and I think one of the Tribune editorials carried this same theme - "now the proposer of this resolution in my opinion had a wonderful opportunity to make a real contribution to this tradition. I would suggest to him that if following that minority government at the next election he had proposed that the Speaker would be unopposed in the general election that followed, he would have really played a part in furthering - and greater - and further honouring the office of the Chair in this House far more than a resolution of this type would do." And then he goes on to say that I did not grasp that opportunity.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason that we had no intention of grasping that opportunity was that the understanding had not been carried through. It had not been done in the way that the House had agreed to; that the leaders of the parties had agreed to. The choice had been made not by discussion of the nominee but by the decision of one group and the Honourable, the Leader of the CCF of that day, and I, when we were called into discuss it, were simply met by the statement that the government caucus had decided upon the Speaker. My whole argument, Mr. Speaker, is that the understanding was not carried through. And so I say, why, under those circumstances would the Honourable Member for Brandon or the Tribune newspaper expect us to carry through our side of an undertaking when the other side had not implemented theirs.

Now, so far as the Honourable the Leader of the CCF party was concerned, he seemed to be quite worried about the fact that I had said that I was going to put him on the spot. He seemed to think that there were some deep, dark, diabolical plot in my mind. I meant nothing on that occasion except that he would have the opportunity -- he would be put on the spot by having the opportunity to declare himself on this particular resolution. He went on to say that he had expected me to make some reference to the special constituency or something of that character. Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason that I left the special constituency completely out of the resolution and the discussion, was, as I stated to the House in moving this resolution, I left it out because I was trying to deal with the things that had been unanimously agreed to by this House. The Honourable the First Minister had made a reservation in that regard. He attempted to say a few days ago when we were discussing this matter, that it was much more than a reservation. I maintain it was just a reservation and a very mild one at that, but he had made one, and so I was unable to put that in as one of the matters that had been unanimously agreed to. There was no ulterior motive in leaving it out except that I was trying to get a resolution that would set forth the facts with as little criticism as possible to anyone and at the same time enunciating the principle that I still think is a good one for this House to endorse.

Then my honourable friend, the Leader of the CCF party suggested I was playing politics with this resolution. Well, if I were trying to play politics with it, I'm a pretty poor politician, because nothing could show better than the lack of interest that's taken in the House itself that this is not a politically popular matter to be talking about. Certainly not at this time of night and on a hot day. It just isn't the kind of a thing that arouses the imagination of the people. Why in the name of common sense would I want to play politics with it, and there's an implication in some of the things that have been said that either I'm actuated by an attempt to play politics or by some vindictiveness toward the honourable gentleman who was chosen as Speaker. Neither one of those contains even a shadow of the truth. I have no wish to play politics in this matter. I don't think it's even good politics, but I do think it's right in the long run and I do think that the only way that you will get this permanent Speakership established here is by getting back to the basis that was agreed to at the session that I speak of, by all the parties being at least consulted. If they can't agree, then of course the government will have to go ahead and make the nomination. Well, I protest that there are no politics in this particular resolution.

Then the Honourable Member for Inkster said - in what I thought was a very logical and brief speech - said "Let's be practical about this thing. Let's be practical. The Honourable member who is occupying the Speaker's Chair is doing a good job; certainly he is going to stay in office as long as this government does - for the one House at least. It isn't going to be changed, therefore let's be practical. Why be talking about this thing?" I had said that same thing in my remarks -- in other words, it's true -- but I had said the same thing -- right in the resolution, I used the expression "as soon as practicable" -- to implement this program as soon as practicable. And speaking on it in the House here I said I recognize that the situation is going to

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . continue as it is for the time being. I'd exactly the same idea as my honourable friend and I still say that we must be practical about this. This is not an attempt to get rid of the present Speaker.

And then I must read briefly, and even though it doesn't so appear to the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, I assure you I am trying to be brief in this. The Honourable Member for St. Vital - and I'm sorry that he's not here either -- but I have no great criticism to make of what he said. At the bottom of page 1180, he says "and what the resolution in my opinion does, it proposes to do this. Not quite, but almost, by legislation. In other words the parties would have to bind themselves to a selection of a Speaker before the House actually met, to make the final choice. The Honourable Leader of the CCF party says that the amendment says nothing of a concrete nature, or says nothing of a concrete nature is proposed in the amendment, and neither there should be, because this is a custom which has to grow, a custom that we mustn't force." Well now with that latter part, I agree. This is a custom that has to grow; it mustn't be forced. That's correct, but at the same time we surely shouldn't turn our backs on the great start that we made on this program in the 24th Legislative Assembly. Because, Mr. Speaker, it was at that time the understanding that the choice of Mr. Speaker should, so far as possible, be made by mutual consent between the political parties of the House. And I'm agreeing that it's a practice that should develop and grow. It can't be put into legislation. We're not trying to do that, but to repeat my central theme once again; the whole point of the argument is that it is founded upon the proposition that we must have at least discussion by the various groups in the House in an attempt to reach agreement. It can't always be done of course, but the idea was that it should be attempted.

Then Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the CCF this morning, even this morning, he said that if the amendment to the amendment which I know has now been disposed of, but if the amendment to the amendment were implemented, it would mean that the present Speaker could not be re-elected. By no means, Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't have meant anything such as that at all. All that this principle would mean would be that the leaders of the groups reporting to, and for their groups, would meet together for a discussion of the selection of Mr. Speaker, and anyone who was proposed at that time could be discussed -- or more than one -- in a fair and reasonable and frank manner; and then if there couldn't be agreement, then of course the government would have to make the nomination.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly not going to argue the point anymore at this stage, but I do want to urge the honourable members to not pass the amendment because the amendment is going back from what we have already decided in this House to do. We decided that we would improve upon the old country practice. We decided that we would try and get a method of selecting Mr. Speaker, that would not expose him to the hazards that he does meet over there. There are other reasons besides that, of course. I have mentioned before, that one of the reasons that Mr. Speaker doesn't stay as long in office over there, as we have contemplated that he might do here, is because of the very handsome pension that he has, and because I suppose, as well, that he's usually a fairly senior member of the party that chooses him, which means that frequently he's not a very young man. But whatever the reason, he is subjected to the hazard of an election at times, and we thought, in talking this over that there would be the likelihood of some at least of that being removed if we had this completely nonpartisan approach. Now I can understand, as I said earlier, that my honourable friends in the front row might feel that there was some implied criticism in some clauses of this resolution, but I can assure them that I did my level best to tone down that criticism just as far as it could possibly be done and yet state the facts, so that if we could, that we would still agree that the principle that was enunciated at the Twenty-fourth Legislature would again be endorsed at this one.

MR. ROBLIN: The skill with which the Honourable Member has moved his case this evening, prompts me to say a word or two in reply, because what has not come out in this debate so far is the fact that this essential measure of disagreement as to the procedure to be followed, was in fact, expressed in the House by myself on the part of my party when the original debate took place. I think we should be clear about that. It's perfectly true that I agreed to second one of the resolutions that is concerned in this matter, and I see nothing wrong in having taken that course. But at the time I did so, I made it perfectly clear that we were not complaining about the conduct of the Speakership in this House at the time when we were in Opposition and

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . the honourable former member for Fisher was the Speaker of the House. Not only did I make that point clear then, but I'm sure if my honourable friend will cast his mind back to the private conversations we had on that point, I made it very clear that we did not think that the Speakership in Manitoba was being conducted in anything other than a perfectly satisfactory way. We had no complaints to offer about the conduct of Mr. Speaker, and no complaints to offer whatsoever about his impartiality. Oh yes, we had had disagreements and different opinions as to his rulings, and we had advocated our differing views rather strenuously -- some of them had even been pressed to a vote -- and if I were asked to say what I thought about the points in question I might be tempted to say that we were right. But we never questioned Mr. Speaker's good faith in his judgment or his rulings when he was in the Chair at that time. Now I made quite a point of that particular expression of opinion because at that time we made it clear that we placed our confidence in following the tradition that had been established in the senior Chamber and which is referred to in this resolution that is before us tonight. We had no use -- and I made it quite clear, I'm sure privately and publicly, to my honourable friend -- for the device of a special constituency. For what does that solve? It only places the matter at one remove away from the situation that we're in today. We still have to face the question -- if we should have such a special constituency -- we should still have to face the question of electing a Speaker, and the same question of getting reasonable agreement or unanimity of opinion to present itself exactly as it does today. And it seemed to me that there were so many reasons against it that we should not contemplate any change of that sort. And while my honourable friend's recollection may lead him to believe -- and I don't question his integrity for one second, and on this point -- I would like to assure him and assure the House that in my mind my reservations were very complete on that point. And in my mind at least, if not in his, we felt that the present system was working with reasonable satisfaction and could see no reason to get excited about making a change in a system that worked with reasonable effectiveness, and which as far as we were concerned, protected the rights of minorities, protected the rights of individual members, and conducted the House in line with the traditions of the past.

So while agreeing to second - to one of the two resolutions that was placed before us then, the other one was seconded by the Leader of the CCF party -- it was not done on my part with any sense that we were in any imperative need of any change in the system which was being conducted then. However, we did agree that we would, the three of us as party leaders, consult on the selection of Mr. Speaker, should the occasion arise. Well, consultations took place. My honourable friend doesn't think of them in that light. He has made that perfectly clear. He considers that he received an ultimatum from the government party as to who the Speaker should be. Now I want to say frankly that the caucus of the Conservative party have had a very clear mind of its own as to who the Speaker was to be, and I want to say equally frankly that when I went to the meeting in respect of this matter, and it seems to me that there were more than one, I made that point abundantly clear. But in spite of having done that, I think my honourable friend will recall that we did discuss alternative names. We discussed for example, the name of the then Leader of the CCF party. The one man in the ranks of his party that might have been considered. I think his name was proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and we did discuss that. He declined it. The other name that was discussed if my memory does not betray me, was the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and it soon became apparent that the Leader of the CCF party was not inclined to support that nomination although he had the highest regard for that honourable gentleman as we all had. What finally happened was that the present nominee was selected as being the one man on whom a majority of those present at the meeting could agree on. And I would like to remind you, Sir, that at that time this government had not a majority; we had a minority. And it is perfectly obvious that unless we could persuade somebody in the opposition side, either the Leader of the CCF or the Leader of the Liberal Party that our nominee was acceptable to them, that we would not have been able to get our own way. Now these are difficult matters to discuss because one of the prominent parties to it is not here to speak for himself. And I want to be very careful that I don't in any way misrepresent him. But I can say that when this matter first arose, I took the trouble to get in touch with him and ask him if his recollection of the affair coincided with mine, namely, that he had in the end agreed with me on the name of the present nomination of Mr. Speaker, and he told me that that was his recollection of how the matter ultimately was solved.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) So that while my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, doesn't seem to think that the consultations that took place were the proper sort -- he has the impression that it consisted of an ultimatum as far as we were concerned -- I do not find that the Leader of the CCF party at that time shared that view, and in fact in the event, as we all know, he was willing to support the nominee of the administration, he certainly didn't have to do it! And had we not been able to persuade one of the two honourable gentlemen to accept our suggestion on it, we know what would have happened when the Legislature was convened.

But my honourable friend, the former leader of the CCF party, gave me his assurance of the conversations that we had at that time and I am glad that I took the opportunity to consult him, that he was not in any sense as far as he was concerned under the impression that he was yielding to an ultimatum. He was quite sure that we knew who we wanted for Speaker, - that's fair enough - but he stated that in the -- when the discussions were through, he accepted our nominee and not under duress. Well, now those are two very different stories as to what took place when Mr. Speaker was suggested. I don't really think much good comes of exhuming these memories -- and that's what they are -- of the three men that took part in the discussions on that particular occasion. I am interested in seeing Mr. Speaker chosen on a basis that is as acceptable as may be to all the members of the House. I want to make it clear, however, that at no time did we express our dissatisfaction with the methods that had been used heretofore and made it clear that we are not interested in radical changes in the selection of Mr. Speaker, and although my honourable friend was disagreed with me on this point on a number of occasions, my recollection of what took place and also I think, the recollection of the former Leader of the CCF, was that when the chips were down we did ultimately, at least the two of us, come to an amicable arrangement as to who Mr. Speaker should be.

Now that's all I want to say about this matter, Sir. I think our present Speaker has abundantly deserved the confidence that was placed in him by the Leader of the CCF party and myself at that time, and I feel that the interests of the House could best be served by supporting the amendment that is before us now.

Mr. Speaker put the question and following a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Boulic, Christianson, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLéan, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Weir, Willis, Witney and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Miller, Molgat, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas -- 36; Nays -- 10.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, if I hadn't been paired with the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, I would have voted for the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. A. PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I had exhausted my right to speak on the amendment which has just been supported and thereby could not make any comment in respect of the remarks of the Leader of the House apropos the conversations between the three leaders at the time of the minority government. It is unfortunate at least in my opinion, that the electors of the constituency of my provincial leader saw fit not to have him here in the House, otherwise he would have been able to fully enter into this debate. However, I think in all fairness to the First Minister, I should say this, that while I did not know or we did not know in our caucus all of the matters under consideration between the three leaders at that particular time, I think in fairness to the Honourable the Premier, I should say that after discussions had been held between the Honourable the Premier, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Stinson, our caucus was consulted and we were informed of the name of the present Mr. Speaker being proposed and our caucus came to the conclusion that we would support the government nominee of that minority government. I thought I should say that, Mr. Speaker, simply to point out that the matter got beyond the question of just the discussions of

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . the leader and that our caucus at that time supported the nomination of our present Mr. Speaker. And I think, Sir, that I've made it amply clear in the contribution that I made to the debate on the question raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that we of our particular group have not seen any reasons at all to change our opinion in that respect. And I thought, Sir, that in deference to my provincial leader, Mr. Lloyd Stinson, I should just make this brief statement.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if there is no one else wishing to speak, I'm prepared to move the adjournment of the debate. Of course, if anyone else wishes to, I'd be glad to have them do so.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

Mr. Speaker put the question and following a voice vote, declared the debate adjourned.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, that's the end of our Order Paper. Before I move the adjournment, I would just like to remind the House, Sir, that we will be having Law Amendments at 10:00 o'clock, therefore we will not be meeting in this Chamber in the morning until after Law Amendments, and if it goes the way I rather suspect, we'll probably be adjourning now until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. So, if that's agreeable I'll move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned 'till 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Speaker put the question and following a voice vote, declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.

SPEECHES IN FRENCH

MR. DESJARDINS: Monsieur l'orateur il me fait plaisir de feliciter le general Georges Philias Vanier qui vient d'etre nommer Gouverneur-General par sa Majeste la Reine. La Reine et les autorites federales ont certainement fait un choix ideal. Le general Vanier est le deuxieme Canadien eleve a ce poste personifie le Canadien par excellence. Son pere membre d'une vieille famille canadienne-française epousa une jeune irlandaise et le jeune Vanier herita les belles qualites de ces deux races mais demeura toujours et avant tout un canadien. Parfait bilingue, fier de son origine et de sa religion il sut tout de fois condamner les fanatiques meme ceux de sa propre province. Je prie Dieu de conserver le general Vanier pendant de longues anees encour pour lui permettre de continuer a si bien servie son pays. Son exemple j'en suis sur saura unir davantage tous les canadiens au service de leur pays.

MR. ROBLIN: Monsieur l'orateur je suis certain que toute la Chambre felicite le prochain gouverneur-general de notre pays.