

Inquiries of the Ministry

think it is the proper thing for the Speaker of either house to take part in a political meeting?

Mr. Diefenbaker: All I can say to that is that I do not think it was a political meeting.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REFERENCE TO PUBLICATION "CANADA AND THE UNITED NATIONS, 1956-1957"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister based on a printed note in the document "Canada and the United Nations, 1956-1957", copies of which have just recently been distributed. Is the Prime Minister aware of the fact that in this special foreword which is over the signature "J. G. Diefenbaker" there appears this sentence, "I am anxious that this record should be available to Canadians because my government believes firmly—", and so on. Is "my government" the correct usage? Should it not be "the government" or "the government of Canada" or "Her Majesty's Government"?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prime Minister): I must say that I did not notice the exact wording, but my recollection is that it is proper in either alternative. As a matter of fact I might not personally choose one or the other, but I see nothing at all that is necessary to be referred to derogatorily or otherwise or to be answered apologetically in that connection.

REQUEST FOR CORRECTION IN "VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West): I would request a correction relating to a debate that took place a week ago, at the time the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) moved that the house adjourn to consider a matter of vital importance. On that occasion he forgot to make the motion, as established by the debate reported on pages 1735 to 1737 inclusive of *Hansard* for December 2. The note in *Votes and Proceedings* covering that day, December 2, reads in part as follows:

Mr. Martin (Essex East) moved—That the house do now adjourn.

I would request that this note either be deleted or possibly enlarged to indicate what actually happened, and to bring it into line with the *Hansard* report.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member suggest what change he would ask the house to approve?

Mr. Thomas (Middlesex West): I would suggest that it either be deleted or revised to show what subsequently happened.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of what my hon. friend has pointed out, if a correction is going to be made it should be noted that as a result of the motion which he says was not technically put, the government, four days later, was forced to take some kind of action.

Mr. Speaker: I consider that last statement to be highly improper, and by leave of the house I would ask that it be expunged from *Hansard*.

Mr. Chevrier: No.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): On a point of order, it is arguable whether or not the observation was in order, but there certainly is no jurisdiction, within that authority exercised by Your Honour, to expunge a remark no matter how valid or invalid it may be. I suggest that Your Honour perhaps is correct in saying I should not have made that observation; but once having made it, it must stay as a matter of record.

Mr. Speaker: I agree that there is no authority to expunge, except on an order of the house, but my point was that I considered the hon. member's remark quite out of place at that time, because we were discussing an amendment to *Votes and Proceedings*. He was making an argument or drawing a conclusion to the disadvantage of the government, as I understand it, and it seems to me that the rules of the house should permit a response to be made where something is improperly put on *Hansard*. Otherwise one side of the argument is presented and, if it is out of order, the other side has no opportunity of correcting the statement. That was the reason I made perhaps the rather hasty suggestion that it might be expunged. But I would ask the hon. member not to indulge in such remarks. Otherwise I shall be obliged to hear correcting remarks on a question of privilege or otherwise.

Mr. Fleming: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, may I say at once that the remark was utterly untrue.

Mr. Thomas (Middlesex West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. Speaker: We now have had two objectionable statements, and I am going to cancel them one against the other and ask hon. members not to pursue the matter further.