

Mr. STEWART: In view of the fact that the hon. member might stumble across a conclusion, may I remind him that he has fourteen minutes to speak yet.

Mr. MAYBANK: You see, Mr. Speaker, the general tenor of that interruption. Obviously the hon. gentleman was not good-natured in that interruption, but I am not complaining about that, because, as I said, I do not really care whether interruptions are good-natured or not, although naturally it is better if a person is house-broken and acts with good nature.

Perhaps a correct and precise answer could be given to the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart), who so gratuitously interrupted what I was saying, and that is that it would be more appropriate if he put his question on the order paper.

Mr. KNOWLES: The answer might be prohibited by section 81.

Mr. MAYBANK: While I am aware of the claim made by socialist members of the house to a monopoly of nearly all the virtues—and I am not going to argue with them about that—

Mr. HOMUTH: The people of Canada settled that.

Mr. MAYBANK: —because after all, if they think they have all the virtues, I am not one who would really without need go and try to destroy happiness, even if that happiness arises from ignorance, I would say to the hon. gentleman that I believe the virtue of candour—I think it is a virtue, by the way—might be studied a little more by him and perhaps by some of his colleagues, and an attempt might be made to become more candid and frank in the presentation of matters of this sort. The hon. member began his dissertation by saying that he supposed that he was introducing something which is efficacious. It is not so. He introduced it and spoke as if it were efficacious toward some end. He said it would not require a minister of the crown to make disclosures. Mr. Speaker, the real object of this is to have disclosures made. Surely we do not need to sit opposite each other and try to fool each other by pulling curtains in front of our faces like Turkish women outside the harem. What the hon. member wants—and I can understand his wanting it, and I must say that I think everybody has some sympathy with the idea—is to get these disclosures. That is the object of the amendment. Why he had to introduce a story about it not requiring a minister to make disclosures I cannot understand and certainly do not appreciate. It would seem

[Mr. Maybank.]

to me that it is not necessary to endeavour to sugar-coat that kind of pill as though he were giving castor oil to a child.

I do not really think, sir, that there was quite the candour that this house has a right to expect from the hon. member. He first of all tried to drag the house along with him by saying that a minister would not have to give out information. I really think that when we come to deal with concrete matters we shall get along a whole lot faster and we shall get along having confidence in each other a great deal more if that sort of thing is done away with altogether. The fact of the matter is—

Mr. KNOWLES: I rise to a question of privilege—

Mr. MAYBANK: If I am in order I shall continue, but if the hon. member is in order I shall sit down. I ask for a ruling, sir.

Mr. KNOWLES: I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. member has questioned my candour.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: Not only has he questioned it, but he has cast a reflection—

Mr. MAYBANK: May I reply? I understand the hon. member has risen to a question of privilege and has said that I questioned his candour. Well, I agree with him, I have. Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, we are enjoying the good will that is prevailing here, but I feel I must object to the way in which this debate is being allowed to develop into something of a farce. I rise to a question of privilege on the following grounds. According to citation 299 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, a citation under standing order 41, there are a number of unparliamentary phrases. One prohibition reads as follows:

No member will be permitted to say of another that he could expect no candour from him.

I am not raising any great fuss about it, Mr. Speaker. I recognize the mood the hon. member is in, but it does seem to me that he is sailing pretty close to the wind.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member rose to a question of privilege, alleging that the hon. member who has the floor attacked his integrity. I do not think that the character, integrity or honesty of the hon. member has been attacked by the hon. member who has the floor. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr.