

Knowles) has the impression that the hon. member who has the floor did that I am sure that the hon. member will modify it.

Mr. MAYBANK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour and hon. members will recall precisely what I said. I should now like to soften it by saying that I intended no offence at all and was not attacking the integrity of the hon. member.

Mr. HOMUTH: Just his judgment.

Mr. KNOWLES: What about the bill?

An hon. MEMBER: Three minutes to go.

Mr. MAYBANK: I should like to thank the hon. member who raised the question of privilege for the remarks he made when he said he felt that the matter in question had developed into something of a farce. Of course it will not be unnoticed by you, sir, and hon. members of the house, that he was impelled to make that remark that this debate had deteriorated into something of a farce at a certain moment. It will not have been overlooked by you, sir, that the moment which he chose for coming to that conclusion was the moment when he himself rose to speak. I must say once again this evening that I am in hearty agreement with him, because I felt it was most farcical on his part to raise such a ridiculous question of privilege as he did.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like—

Mr. KNOWLES: What about the bill?

An hon. MEMBER: Three minutes to go.

Mr. MAYBANK: The hon. member says, "what about the bill?" After he has done his utmost to get the engine off the track he complains that it is off.

Mr. KNOWLES: There are only two minutes left to talk it out.

Mr. MAYBANK: He himself spoke once or twice and said what he had to say about the elections in Manitoba and that they were related to the bill. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, he did not tell you that most of the C.C.F. candidates who were beaten there lost their deposits, but you will find that out. It will also be borne in mind that when he gave the figures—I do not know whether this was lack of candour or not—he left out of his remarks the fact that there were seven acclamations. He did not bother counting those; and, of course, the votes about which he spoke came largely from the large centres of population. Because of the manner in which our democratic processes work nearly all the candidates who were defeated lost their deposits. The house

will find out a little more about this later on, but in the meantime I give it that tid-bit to sharpen the appetite.

There are several matters connected with this bill to which I should like to refer. I observe, sir, that it has now reached the hour of nine o'clock.

Mr. HOMUTH: You talked for an hour and did not know it.

Mr. MAYBANK: I was a little afraid, sir, that I might be stopped suddenly, and to avoid that I crave the privilege of adjourning the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour reserved for private and public bills having expired, the house will revert to the order of business under consideration at six o'clock.

UNITED NATIONS

APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT SIGNED AT SAN FRANCISCO, JUNE 26, 1945

The house resumed consideration of the motion of the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs:

That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the agreement establishing the united nations and constituting the charter of the united nations and the statute of the international court of justice signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, and that this house do approve the same.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock I was speaking of the close cooperation between the several members of the Canadian delegation at San Francisco. There was cooperation also not only within our delegation, but with other delegations as well, in respect of the work done at San Francisco. There was, first of all, the closest consultation among members of the British commonwealth. There were frequent commonwealth meetings at which frank discussions took place, but I think the San Francisco conference has proved for once and all the absurdity of the notion that all the countries of the British commonwealth will always speak and vote as a single block.

I do not want to enter into details at this stage, but if hon. members wish they may find some report of the divergence of views taken upon matters discussed at San Francisco, if they will refer to pages 18, 27 and 41 of the conference document No. 2, the report of the activities of the Canadian delegation at the conference.

It was, on the whole, by a process of free vote and discussion in the conference committees that the charter was fashioned. The individual efforts of any one delegation to secure advantage in the discussion could not