

upon the Prime Minister and his cabinet, or his party in the house. I am certain the Prime Minister must have weighed the situation very carefully before he made this motion. May I just suggest one or two things at this point. The hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains was once a member of the Liberal party. He has disagreed with its policies. The time came when he eventually crossed the floor of the house. May I interject here that while the Prime Minister said a moment or two ago that there was very much loose talking, and that it perhaps resulted in the hon. member's making this statement, it is perhaps the result, too, of a beclouded policy held by the party which is now on the government side of the house, and that has caused an antagonism to arise on the part of this hon. member. Be that as it may, he did not agree with the government's policy, but crossed the floor to this side of the house. He stands alone. As a result, naturally his feelings are very keen in respect to his duties here. As a result of that he has caused some trouble in the house in days gone by. I am not speaking in behalf of the hon. member, for I have no brief for him. I am speaking of the interpretation which may be given to this motion. His feelings ran high last Friday afternoon when he made certain statements. The Prime Minister has seen the seriousness of these statements, and made a statement the other day about them, the result of which has been to-day's procedure. The hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains rose and withdrew his statement, with what some hon. members considered to be a certain qualification.

Mr. HOMUTH: Quite.

Mr. HANSELL: Now it would appear perhaps that the Prime Minister is not satisfied with that withdrawal, and seizes upon the opportunity of putting over—of putting a motion to the house which may result in the house getting rid of this member. I am saying that that could be the interpretation. And I think I can say that perhaps it will be the interpretation in some sections of this country, anyway.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask the hon. member if that is his belief? He is making insinuations. I ask him to make a direct statement.

Mr. HANSELL: I am making no insinuations at all, and the Prime Minister cannot do with me what perhaps he thinks he can do with some people. I am making no insinuations. As a matter of fact I am trying to protect the Prime Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HANSELL: I am saying that the interpretation in this country may be as I have said. I am simply following that up by suggesting what I believe to be a way out of the difficulty. What I am going to suggest may be regarded as—well, shall I say not a hundred per cent technically, according to parliamentary procedure. I am going to suggest this, that you might ask the hon. member for Laval Two-Mountains if he will now unqualifiedly withdraw his statement. If he answers yes, then cannot the Prime Minister respond by saying that he will withdraw his motion?

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, as an old defender of widows and orphans I submit respectfully that I have some sympathy, in the first place, with the hon. member for Battle River, because when he started to speak there was some noise; perhaps someone was coughing. At any rate I know there was some noise which could have been interpreted as an interruption. It is against the principles of democracy to interrupt a member by making a noise, other than by putting a legitimate question, when he is addressing the Chair. He comes from a good Celtic race and perhaps was a little quick in making some observations, no doubt feeling that the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains would not receive fair treatment before the committee on privileges and elections. I would remind the house of a case which had just been submitted to that committee involving a former member of the house, a man who is no longer a member, but who received fair treatment. All the members had a good word for him.

Let us come down to fundamentals. According to the Interpretation Act each publication which bears the name of the king's printer and comes from the printing bureau is official and is admitted as evidence before any court of the land, and must be accepted as such. The only difficulty in this case is that there are two texts of *Hansard*, but each of them is not a translation. It is what we call a version. There is the French version and the English version, or the French text and the English text. Both are admitted as evidence in a court of law. But on the other hand, as the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains spoke in French the report of his remarks is in French, and the English translation is entirely different from the French text. In the French text he used the words which appear in the resolution now before the house:

Nous avons dans le Gouvernement trois nouveaux millionnaires depuis la déclaration de la guerre.