

Committee on Defence Expenditure

That is a bald statement, I must point out, a statement with no attempt to produce evidence to support it.

The hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Knight) read it—

And then, this is the logic.

—because he is reported in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* as having said that the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) was the man who threw the bomb into the Liberal party.

That, sir, is his idea of logic. As I said last night, I did not use the expression that Mr. Knowles, or anybody else, had thrown a bomb into the Liberal party because, as I said yesterday, that was not necessary. It had already been done, by themselves—by a bomb which exploded among them, at their own feet, and which is causing the disintegration of this government, and of the Liberal party upon which it is based. That surely is evident, and becomes increasingly clear during the course of this debate.

However, to go back to what my hon. friend said—and this caused me some amusement, because I was interested in how he distinguishes the various characteristics of the professions. He said that there were four classes of men who never betrayed a confidence, and listed them as doctors, chartered accountants, lawyers and bankers.

These, said he, were all pledged to secrecy.

Then he comes forth again, with the kind of logic to which I have already referred, and says that because Mr. Currie is one of those who, as it were, are sworn to secrecy, and yet allowed some information in the form of a report to leak out of his office, therefore Mr. Currie and the whole report must be condemned.

I am flattered by the hon. member's reference to me. He even dignified me by allocating to me some promotions. This is what he said:

The hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Knight) was also a teacher and is supposed to be a professor.

Well, I did not like to interrupt him, but I could have said that I have never been promoted to that high degree of eminence. It flattered me, nevertheless, when he referred to me and to my leader as ex-school teachers. Referring to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre he used the word "preacher", and suggested that a man of that type, of that high calibre, knew that the report should have been sent back immediately.

He said at one place I should have sent the report back to its place of origin.

The one man in Saskatoon—

Says he—

—according to his statement, must have read the document.

[Mr. Knight.]

And so, in line with his logic, the man from Saskatoon should have sent the report back. He neglected, of course, to mention one trifling matter, one which I suggest is relevant to the argument, and that is that in the first place the man from Saskatoon does not know the origin of the report; the man from Saskatoon has not even yet read the report; and the man from Saskatoon saw it only once—and that at a distance, in the hands of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. Of course, that is just a trifling detail to the hon. member for Mackenzie.

Then there was the interesting matter of the bombshell. Mr. Knight, according to the *Star-Phoenix*—and this appears to be the view of my hon. friend—is reported to have said that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre threw the bombshell into the Liberal party.

Let me say that I did make a speech in Saskatoon. Let me say to my hon. friend that it was a well attended meeting of very interested people. What I was doing was simply describing the dramatic situation which took place in the House of Commons. I said that the throne speech debate was dragging along; nobody was paying too much attention. And then, suddenly, into that lethargic situation my hon. friend threw a bombshell—the bombshell, of course, being the disclosure of the report which at the moment he had in his hip pocket. But there is no reference whatever to throwing bombshells into any party.

Mr. Smith (Moose Mountain): Was it stolen?

Mr. Knight: That is a sample of what took place in connection with the bombshell.

Mr. Ferris: Why did you say that a bombshell was thrown, if you had not seen the report and did not know anything about it? You say you were ignorant of the fact that it was in existence. Yet, why did you say anything about the bombshell?

Mr. Knight: My hon. friend has simply misinterpreted my words—

Mr. Ferris: Oh, we always do, according to you.

Mr. Knight: —as he misunderstood the meaning of them last night. Before my hon. friend came into the house I had just pointed out that he was somewhat weak in logic when he says that I must have read the report. Forsooth, because I said that my hon. friend had thrown a bombshell into the quietness of the house. I submit that my hon. friend's statement is not logical. In any case, I have just explained the incident and if my hon. friend will read *Hansard* tomorrow perhaps he will be able to understand it.