

where there was a really hectic division and where one vote changed the parties in the house, was the division in which I voted against the government and put them out. That was the one division, and I say that the article in the Gazette—whether I was right or wrong in voting as I did does not matter in the meantime—is a lie or misrepresentation. The article goes on:

In these circumstances may be found some reason why the member for Peace River—Mr. Kennedy was reelected at the next election—

Which is another misrepresentation, because I was opposed by both Liberals and Conservatives in that election.

—should speak to the government in plain terms, if he so desires, and he so desired on Friday last. He complained that he and his friends were suffering the disadvantages of both free trade and protection,—

I still claim that.

—while the manufacturers were receiving the benefits of both. He denied that the purpose of the U.F.A. is to bludgeon the government, though an attempt has been made to keep the Liberal party true to its pledges. Indicating the Liberals and Progressives, Mr. Kennedy is reported to have said as follows:

Then the quotation which I have already read appears in full. The article goes on:

Whether the member for Peace River used the word "deal" or the word "bargain"—reports of his remarks differ in this respect—is not very material, the sense being the same.

I had complained of misrepresentation, and I want the Prime Minister to hear this. The Gazette misrepresented the facts, and the Prime Minister, to make a case against me, last year cut a sentence right in two; and in his remarks, before cutting that sentence in two, he utterly misrepresented my statement. I quote from Hansard of March 13, 1928, at page 1299, where the Prime Minister is reported to have said:

He made a statement in this house the other evening to the effect that the most effective way a class group could act might be to see what bargain it could make with a party whose known principles were wholly opposed to its own.

What were his words? He said . . . "the only thing for us to do is to go and make the very best possible deal with the protectionists and see what they can do for us."

That is the quotation from the sentence:

It is not a very big step for the people of the west, and particularly the people of Alberta, to say that if we cannot get tariff reductions in a general way—and it looks as if that were the case—the only thing for us to do is to go and make the very best possible deal with the protectionists—

That is a complete misrepresentation of that sentence. What I had in mind, and the illustration I used, was that the dairy farmers

[Mr. Kennedy.]

of the west, because of their dissatisfaction with the action of the government in connection with the Australian treaty, actually took that course; they stated that they were anxious to wipe out the Australian treaty purely on a protectionist basis. There is no question of that, but the Prime Minister made the statement that I said the only thing for a "class group" to do was to turn right around and make a deal with the protectionists.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is the statement to which my hon. friend is referring a statement made by myself in the House of Commons?

Mr. KENNEDY: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Why did not my hon. friend correct the statement at the time, if it was not right? I was merely quoting what he said.

Mr. KENNEDY: It is all very well to ask why I did not get up and correct a statement of that kind when I did not have the actual words before me. In the one case the sentences were all together and in the other case they were cut in two. As a private member of this house I want to say that I have a right to more courteous treatment than that from the Prime Minister. I do not care how hard the Prime Minister or anyone else on any side of the house attacks me with regard to principles or in argument, but I absolutely refuse to have my sentences carved in two, with a half used here and the other half somewhere else in order to make me say something I did not say at all. That is what was done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It looks as though my hon. friend were seeking to make a martyr of himself. What he has read to the house now simply corroborates what I said at the time I spoke. I took his words as they appeared in Hansard; I repeated them in the house when the hon. member was present and all he says now is that he could not have been expected to have known then what he had previously said.

Mr. KENNEDY: The argument advanced by the Prime Minister is a first class illustration of the type of argument used in a particular case. Two men were arguing about theology; one man told the other that by his way of arguing suicide could be justified by the Bible. To support that argument he quoted two sentences: "Judas hanged himself" and "Go thou and do likewise". I will stand by the sentence on the possibility of co-