

second paragraphs of the second column of page 3893 of Hansard of Monday, April 3, commencing with the words "Le correspondant" and ending with the words "le premier ministre," and also the fourth paragraph of the first column of page 3894 commencing with the words "Il y a un paragraphe" and ending with the words "pour bien faire," the remarks therein being entirely improper and unparliamentary on that occasion.

The practice in England in dealing with a newspaper article alleged to be a breach of privilege is found in May, pages 98-99—

When a complaint is made of a newspaper the newspaper itself must be produced, in order that the paragraphs complained of may be read. A member complaining of the report of his speech in a newspaper, has been stopped by the Speaker, when it appeared that he had no copy of the newspaper on which to found his complaint. It is irregular to make such a complaint, unless the member intends to follow it up with a motion, but such a motion has been confined to declaring the article, or letter, to be a breach of privilege, without further action.

In this house the practice has been for the member to cite the article, point out that it is a breach of privilege, and that he has been misrepresented. It is not permissible for him to go further when so speaking.

Quoting from Blackmore's decisions by Speakers Dennison and Brand at page 248 on an occasion when an hon. member complained to the house of certain newspaper articles as libellous of an hon. member and constituting a breach of privilege and an objection being taken that the hon. member was entering into extraneous matters, the Speaker said "The hon. member is bound to confine himself strictly to the question of privilege which he has brought before the house," and quoting from Peel's decision, House of Commons, page 107, "If motion is made that certain passages in a newspaper constitute a breach of privilege, the discussion must be strictly confined to whether the words read at the table do constitute a breach of privilege," and so in this house discussions must be similarly limited.

PRIVILEGE—MR. BENNETT

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): I desire to direct attention to the fact that yesterday, as reported at page 3947 of Hansard, the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) added to the report of Hansard certain words which he said were used by me on the preceding day. I had not seen the report of Hansard, nor was I able at that moment to send for it; as a matter of fact I have seen it for the first time within the last hour. I find that the report in Hansard, which was not revised, was made from the sheet

which I hold in my hand. It did not contain the words which the hon. member for Témiscouata has sought to add to what I said, and I deny the right of that member to add to any observation made by me in the house. I therefore ask that the words in question be deleted; otherwise, it would permit any hon. gentleman in the house to impugn the accuracy of a statement in Hansard and make remarks for other members of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may say that, after reading the report of the remarks made yesterday by the hon. member of Témiscouata, I examined the transcript of the report made by the reporter on the occasion and I find that the words in question were not reported. I have discussed the matter with the Editor of Debates and he informs me that no such words were reported and therefore were not deleted, nor has the report of Hansard been in any way changed. I direct that the remarks made by the hon. member for Témiscouata in this connection be expunged from the record; they should not have been made.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): I beg to lay on the table of the house a number of orders in council passed pursuant to relief legislation.

COURTS OF ADMIRALTY

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 66 respecting the courts of admiralty.

He said: I might offer a word of explanation in regard to this bill. At the present time the admiralty courts in Canada are constituted and obtain their jurisdiction under the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act of 1890, passed by the parliament of Great Britain. In the year 1929 a conference was held in London on the operation of dominion legislation. That conference made a report regarding the question of admiralty and other matters and the report was taken up at the Imperial conference which met in London in 1931. It was adopted and has been subsequently ratified in effect by the statute of Westminster, passed by the parliament of Great Britain and by the parliament of Canada. Under the authority of the statute of Westminster this parliament can now pass an admiralty act and establish a court of admiralty, as proposed in this measure. I may inform the house that the bill I have now the honour of introducing has been prepared by those considered in this country most capable of dealing with admiralty laws.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.