

War Appropriation Bill

responsibility which rests upon the ministers of the crown. I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that we have a sincere desire to cooperate.

On the other hand, if we banish partisanship for the remainder of the war, we are asking that the government do the same, that there be no suggestion of partisanship in the administration of affairs connected with the war. Our attitude is not as the Minister of Munitions and Supply would have had the people of this country believe the other day. We are not criticizing or attacking him unfairly; our only desire is to see if we can be of assistance at this time. I have a number of suggestions which I should like to make in connection with certain matters and which might well be considered by the government at this time.

I realize that the minister has taken the attitude that Federal Aircraft shall not be dissolved. If Federal Aircraft is falling down, as the minister admits, if I understand him correctly; if it has failed to secure the cooperation and assistance of the other industries from which it secures its supplies, then there is something wrong, and there is some justification for the criticism which has been general throughout Canada. The minister singled out one paper, but I have before me an editorial which appeared in a paper which has consistently supported the government of the day. In reference to the failure of this government effectually to assure a proper flow of aeroplanes, the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix* had this to say on January 29, 1941:

It calls for complete and public enquiry into all circumstances and a direct placing of responsibility. And when responsibility has been placed it calls for penalties and assurances there will be no repetition for this affair gives a strong impression of something rather worse than incompetence and mismanagement.

That is the attitude expressed by the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix* and many other papers throughout Canada.

MR. HOWE: It is what one would call the long view, from Saskatoon to Montreal.

MR. DIEFENBAKER: All across the dominion.

MR. BLACK (Cumberland): Both Halifax papers, the *Chronicle* and the *Herald*, took the same stand. That is why the minister should have given this explanation earlier.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Ralston the house adjourned at 6 p.m.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Monday, March 3, 1941.

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. COLDWELL

REFERENCE TO EDITORIAL IN OTTAWA EVENING
CITIZEN OF MARCH 1

On the orders of the day:

MR. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, I rise to-day on a matter of personal privilege. It is, I may say, the first time in my seventeen years of membership in various public bodies that I have ever done so.

On Saturday last, March 1, the *Ottawa Citizen* devoted most of its editorial page to explanations of its attitude and to bitter personal attacks upon me in my capacity as a member of this house.

The first paragraph to which I wish to draw attention appears in the leading editorial on page 32 of the *Evening Citizen* of March 1. It states:

For saying that the lads after this war, when they come home from overseas, "may know better where to shoot than Canadian veterans did in the years of debt and privation after the last war," the *Citizen* has been accused in the House of Commons of inciting men in uniform when they return from overseas to use force to obtain what they were after. This twisting of the *Citizen's* editorial, done by the C.C.F. member for Rosetown-Biggart, M. J. Coldwell, led Mr. Lapointe to say last Thursday that he agreed with Mr. Coldwell. Mr. Lapointe said:

My honourable friend (Mr. Coldwell) sent me that article, not very long ago. It was a subversive article which was published by the *Ottawa Citizen* on that date, and I may tell him that they will have to answer for it before the courts of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am accused of dishonesty in this house by twisting the editorial in question and thus leading the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) to say that he agreed with me. As a member of this house, as the acting house leader of this group, the accusation thus made is a grave reflection upon my personal integrity.

To say that I twisted the editorial is a charge which the editor of *The Citizen* makes falsely in an attempt to escape the consequences of his written word. If there has been any twisting, surely it has been on the part of the *Citizen*, which is trying to wriggle out of the position in which it finds itself.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) speaking also in this house last Thursday, said:

I read the article and I thought it was more than a borderline case; it seemed to me that it was really an incitement to force.

The leader of the opposition, therefore, placed the same interpretation upon the article as scores of *Citizen* readers also did.