

when we have to seek economies. My colleagues and I have considered the matter to which the hon. members have directed our attention, and after giving it the best possible thought we feel that we must do as I have announced.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): The matter of expense is not important. The work is done by the collector of customs, at no additional expense. I believe the only extra expense involved is that of the services of a stenographer. I am sorry the Prime Minister has not considered favourably the request made. It is not a matter of local pride. It is one of convenience, because this point is a funnel for motor traffic entering the United States. People come there without passports, and have been able to obtain them at that point. Otherwise they would have to travel right back to Moncton.

Mr. STIRLING: Will there now be no local facilities for those people living close to the border in various parts of Canada, whose custom it has been for shopping and entertainment purposes, to slip across the line and back again the same evening?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am informed this will not affect the position of those persons to whom the hon. member has referred. Since mention has been made of tourist traffic, I would remind hon. members that passports are not required of people entering Canada from the United States. United States citizens have a distinct advantage when visiting our country. The freedom from passport requirements saves them considerable trouble.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It has a curiously adverse effect on the tourist traffic.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, February 26, 1941.

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE

MR. POULIOT—EDITORIAL IN OTTAWA JOURNAL OF FEBRUARY 25

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. Since Saturday last there is not a name or an epithet which can be found in any ordinary or slang dictionary which has not been levelled at the member for Témiscouata by the "N.G." press. Naturally the paper with the richest vocabulary is the *Ottawa Journal*. This paper had an editorial [Mr. Mackenzie King.]

covering half a column about me, but that was under cover. In the issue of February 25 there is a report by Mr. Norman MacLeod, the British United Press correspondent, which reads in part as follows:

Actually, Conservative members said, the official opposition party abandoned any hope it had for union government after the recent speech by Jean-François—

At this point the report is continued on page 12:

—Pouliot, Quebec Liberal member, in which he assailed union proponents.

This shows that this paper published falsehoods under the cover of truth.

MR. CHURCH—SPEECH OF MEMBER FOR TRINITY ON FEBRUARY 20

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I should like to correct a statement made in the most interesting speech delivered by the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) on Thursday last. One page 858 of *Hansard* appear these words:

The hon. member for Broadview suggested that something should be done in connection with the amalgamation of our railroads.

What I actually said is to be found on page 856, where I referred to the duplication of our railways and went on to say:

Why could not something be done in that regard to eliminate wastage, as has been done in Great Britain and in the United States?

The second point I wish to raise is this. In the *Toronto Star* of last Friday appeared an article entitled "Let Opposition Open Seats for Supermen." In this article it is stated that the hon. member for Trinity said that I said that the government should give the country "a real war administration." The article then goes on to quote further the words of the hon. member for Trinity as follows:

If it is proposed that members of the government resign in order that mythical men from the outside may come in, the opposition is in a position to demonstrate its bona fides by certain of its members resigning in order that these great men may be brought in in their places. This would show that hon. members opposite really mean what they were saying.

I used no such words as stated by the hon. member. What I did say will be found on page 855 of *Hansard*, as follows:

—that consideration should be given to uniting all parties in the country and in the house so that we may have a real war-time national government. I think the party system is one luxury we can do without during this war; there has been altogether too much of it. A great many people think the government is conducting a Liberal war, and that our war effort is not being carried on in the non-partisan way it should be. There is some element of truth in that suggestion, I am afraid.