Senate to a letter that appears in the Toronto edition of a certain magazine. I crave permission to read the letter, and I promise the House that it will not take longer than two minutes.

(Hon. Mr. Casgrain read the letter in question).

I think the Government cannot act too quickly to contradict such a statement. This was printed in Toronto, that most influential and most active centre for disseminating Bolshevik propaganda.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK: Honourable senators, surely the Senate of Canada should not print in its records the statements that have just been read to us by the honourable member to my right (Hon. Mr. Casgrain). I had already read the article. We all know the statements are erroneous. Then why should the Senate of Canada dignify them by placing them on Hansard? The communication is from Providence, Rhode Island. I repeat, the statements are not true. I would move that they be expunged from our records.

Hon. Mr. MacARTHUR: Would the honourable member include the Press?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Certainly, I would ask the Press to make no reference to the matter. I think the statements are beneath contempt.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I am disposed to agree with the honourable senator from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock). I do not think I ever listened to so scandalous a recital of mendacious rubbish.

Hon. Mr. MacARTHUR: I second the motion.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Surely if you do not defend yourself you are adjudged to be guilty. I know the statements are untrue, but they have done a lot of damage. Failure to contradict officially these false statements, printed in Toronto, is enough to make one hot under the collar; especially one whose three grown-up sons all enlisted for service overseas—two as aviators, one of whom became a prisoner of war in Germany. I have been asked by some very prominent persons to have these malicious statements contradicted officially. They tell me that if the statements are not so contradicted the public may think there is a great deal of truth in them.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: If my honourable friend will allow me—the proper way to have the communication contradicted would be to send it to the returned veterans' association and let them deal with it.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I believe that this article is the work of a Red who is trying to get under somebody's hide. Our answer to the statement is to be found in thousands of graves in France and Canada, and in our hospitals. We do not need to contradict such a contemptible article. It does not deserve any recognition by this honourable House.

The motion was agreed to.

DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE BILL

FIRST READING

Hon. Mr. HUGHES introduced Bill C, an Act respecting the Remarriage of Certain Divorced Persons.

He said: Honourable senators, the object of this Bill is to prevent the guilty party, or the respondent, in a divorce case from remarrying during the lifetime of his or her former spouse to any person other than that spouse.

The Bill was read the first time.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING

Bill D, an Act respecting the Northern Trusts Company.—Hon. Mr. Haig.

ECONOMIC COUNCIL OF CANADA ACT REPEAL BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH moved the second reading of Bill 6, an Act to repeal the Economic Council of Canada Act, 1935.

He said: Honourable members, this Bill possesses at least the merit of brevity, and needs little, if any, explanation. It comes to us from the House of Commons. Its purpose is to repeal an Act passed last session. The Bill then enacted was presented by the right honourable leader of this House at the time (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen) as a Government measure to establish an economic council, and was passed after very little discussion—merely a few remarks by the leader on our side of the House and a word of criticism from another honourable member. The late Government took no action under the statute to set up the proposed economic council. I presume that no part of the $20,000 appropriated last session for the purposes of the council has ever been expended. No similar provision appears in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1937. Apparently the present Government does not intend to act under the statute. In fact, on the second reading of this Bill in the other House, when the Prime Minister was pressed