

*B.N.A. Act—Point of Order*

still another very important point of order. Is an hon. member, under the shelter of that rule, permitted to read a communication or an alleged communication containing statements which he would not make on his own responsibility as a member, statements which by innuendo reflect upon this house or some member or members of the house, particularly when the extract read indicates a conspiracy against the wellbeing of this country? In the quotation the hon. member has named two or three parties and then leaves a blank. Apart from your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the hon. member in the interests of the decency of debate not to follow such a course.

Mr. BENNETT: The limitation is that he assumes the responsibility of his statement.

Mr. DUNNING: He did not say so.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Am I permitted to go on, Mr. Speaker, or is it your ruling that I must withdraw the statement?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Unless you take the responsibility for it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) must reveal the name or take the responsibility himself for the article.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I must give the name, take the responsibility, or what? You see, Mr. Speaker, we do not know the rules by which you people play these games. All we want to know is what are the rules and we will play according to them. As soon as we learn them, we will play according to them pretty hard. I will withdraw the statement, if you say I must. Naturally, I do not propose to take the responsibility for the statement nor do I propose to give the name of the person who wrote it. It cannot be revealed at the present time, so I will withdraw.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member must withdraw or take the responsibility for it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that the hon. member must withdraw the statement or give the name of the author.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I accept your ruling and withdraw the statement. I am glad the members of this house have had a chance to hear it.

Mr. FINN: Strike it out of the record.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The next thing is whether there is anything in this thing.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. DUNNING: I rise to another point of order. The hon. member has just made a very qualified withdrawal which is in entire contradiction to the spirit of the rules of this house. In withdrawing his previous statement, which he was bound to do under the rules, he said, "I am glad the members of this house have had a chance to hear it." I submit that that is contrary to the rules; that the withdrawal must be absolute and unqualified.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point raised by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Dunning) is well taken and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) must withdraw the statement completely.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I withdraw completely.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The withdrawal must not be qualified in any way.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I withdraw completely. May I go on now?

Mr. BENNETT: Since we are discussing this matter and since the hon. member will not accept responsibility, I submit that the statement should be struck out. If the statement is made and no responsibility is accepted, it is obvious that it never should have been read. As it never should have been read, it should not appear in the record.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) is well taken.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is quite satisfactory to me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It will be stricken out of Hansard.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Must I ask that?

Mr. ELLIOTT (Middlesex): It will be done without request.

Mr. BLACKMORE: There are several sections of our own press that are distinctly apprehensive. May I quote again from the Ottawa Citizen of February 5, 1936, from the editorial column, in which there appears an article under the heading "Secession in Australia."

The loan council plan undoubtedly originated outside of Canada. The government of Australia adopted it after Sir Otto Niemeyer, from the Bank of England, had reported on the financial credit situation in the commonwealth. The same authorities at the seat of financial imperialism in London last year were urging the necessity of a so-called national government in Canada. They believed that national government would act as they desired,