

Interim Supply

Miss LaMarsh: It is nice to see you back in the house after two months.

Mr. Smallwood: We will deal with you on your pension plan.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to answer the hon. member for Verdun who said I have not said anything that is interesting; but I would like to suggest to him—and I do not say this sarcastically—with great respect, that I doubt he would understand the kind of constitutional point I am trying to get across at this moment; and I am not being an egotist when I say that. But if he would listen and pay a little more attention, he might learn something.

Mr. Mackasey: On a point of order—

Mr. Woolliams: I do not intend to get into an argument with the hon. member, because he wants to build himself up in the newspapers.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Chairman, I confess that I am not a lawyer but I did understand the clarity and simplicity with which the Minister of Transport pointed out the real facts. This I understood very well. If some time the hon. member for Bow River shows that degree of maturity in the house, I am sure I will be able to understand all that he says.

The Chairman: There is no point of order and I would ask the hon. member for Bow River to continue.

Mr. Woolliams: I am not going to answer the hon. member, because it would be beneath my dignity.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: But I am going to answer something for a few minutes.

Mr. Turner: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if I could suggest to the hon. member that it might also be beneath his dignity to impute motives to the hon. member for Verdun. After all, some of us did not expect he would be speaking in instalments today; and had the Minister of Transport expected a rebuttal to his speech of earlier today, he would have been in his seat. I would think perhaps the hon. member for Bow River would wish to continue without imputing motives to those on this side [Mr. Smallwood].]

of the chamber for whom he has some affection.

Mr. Woolliams: As far as I am concerned I did not impute motives. The minister of health called the Leader of the Opposition or myself—I heard it with my own ears and she looked right at me—a liar, or she said it was a lie, and it is that sort of thing which is ruining the dignity of parliament. However, I should like to answer the argument which has been put forward because I think it is only fair to answer it. I want to read something which might interest the Liberal government. I want to refer to “The Round Table”, a quarterly review of British commonwealth affairs. I do not know whether the hon. member for Verdun will understand this, but this is what the writer says concerning the commonwealth:

Mr. Gordon—

I am not attacking Mr. Gordon but I must read everything; if I do not it will be said that I am talking out of context.

—the Minister of Finance has done something to redeem the calamitous errors of his first budget but is far from having won the complete confidence of the country, while Miss Judy LaMarsh, Minister of National Health and Welfare, has become notorious for her indiscreet utterances.

Then he goes on to say this, and this is one of the reasons I am concerned about the formula. Incidentally, these articles are written by the top people in the commonwealth.

Mr. Turner: To which article is my hon. friend referring?

Mr. Woolliams: If my hon. friend has read “The Round Table” he will know the writers of these articles are selected by a committee.

Mr. Turner: It is an unsigned article.

Mr. Woolliams: Of course it is. No article in the British commonwealth affairs review is signed.

Mr. Turner: Then you cannot read it.

Mr. Woolliams: We are not like the hon. member known as Mr. “Leakman”, who signs his stuff. The writer goes on:

On the eve of the Liberal convention—

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Even on the assumption that the main tenor of the hon. member’s speech is relevant, although the Chair has tolerated this line of argument all day I hardly see how the present intervention is relevant even to an irrelevant speech.

Mr. Woolliams: I am not going to get into an argument because the hon. member