

were appealing last year to the country for support. They were not telling the people at that time that world conditions had anything to do with the situation then existing; it was all put upon the shoulders of the government of the day, which was blamed wholly and exclusively for conditions as they were. But hon. gentlemen had not been in office five minutes before their whole tune changed, and they began to talk about world conditions being responsible for the situation they were about to face.

My right hon. friend speaks about certain conditions antecedent to the world-wide depression—

. . . that many of our problems do not arise out of world-wide depression, but are antecedent to it; and that domestic factors have also largely determined the degree of economic distress from which this country is suffering.

Here again we must ask ourselves what is meant in that particular paragraph by "antecedent conditions". What are the antecedent conditions to which my right hon. friend refers? If I am to judge by some of his correspondence which has been shown to me by different persons, I would assume he is there referring to the great load which he says he is carrying at the present time, a legacy the like of which except in war time no prime minister of Canada has heretofore had to carry. I have seen correspondence of that kind signed by my right hon. friend, but I notice—

Mr. BENNETT: Will my right hon. friend produce it and read it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I can produce some of it.

Mr. BENNETT: If my right hon. friend refers to it he should produce it and read it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I can get permission to produce some of it.

Mr. BENNETT: If it is personal correspondence, reference should not be made to it; otherwise if he refers to correspondence, he is bound to produce it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said that I was referring to certain correspondence which had been shown to me.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not sufficient. I rise to a point of order. We might as well have a thorough understanding that the amenities of debate are to be observed in this house, and one of them is that no hon. member can paraphrase what someone else says if it is in writing, unless he produces it, because he puts on it his own interpretation and not the meaning of the

writer. This anonymous letter business should not be heard of in this house. Let the correspondence be produced or not referred to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let my right hon. friend wiggle as he pleases at this particular moment—

Mr. BENNETT: I am not the wiggler.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is quite apparent that my right hon. friend is fully conscious of certain of his correspondence which was marked "personal" but which was shown to me by the one to whom it was addressed.

Mr. BENNETT: There is a rule of the house on that point. What does the house think of a leader of the opposition who reads a personal letter which he had no right to see and talks of it? In a court of law, any counsel who did that would be dealt with by the judge, and the rule holds good in any decent society such as this house surely is. It is wholly out of order for any hon. member to refer to personal correspondence which someone has shown to him but which he should not have seen, and try to paraphrase what it means.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the Prime Minister had sent me a letter and marked it as "personal" I would have regarded it as such. In reply to a workingman in this country who was complaining about the failure of my right hon. friend and his government to make good their pledges to labour, my right hon. friend took upon himself to write to this man an effusive communication which only helped to add insult to his injury and the man showed the letter to me.

Mr. BENNETT: I ask for a ruling on a point of order. May any member refer to correspondence written to some other person by another member and marked "personal", without producing it? The rule is that no member should put his interpretation upon another man's words without the writing being produced, because the other members are quite as capable of understanding what is meant as is the hon. member speaking. I think the rule is quite clear. It is frequently acted upon in the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the right hon. gentleman will admit that correspondence such as that to which he refers should not be quoted unless the intention is to produce it. If it is a public letter it should be produced. If it is a private letter, it should not; but I think the right hon. gentleman will agree in principle that quotations should not be made from letters unless they are to be produced.