

Mr. GUNN. I saw that a witness was examined before the Committee of Agriculture and according to the report in the press this witness, Mr. Smart, was asked by the member for Jacques Cartier: Do you know—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is still out of order in attempting to refer indirectly to this matter.

Mr. GUNN. If I am to be restricted I am afraid I shall not be able to continue my speech.

Mr. BENNETT. Go right on.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think hon. members should not encourage the hon. gentleman to go right on and attempt to disregard the ruling of the Speaker.

Mr. TISDALE. Cannot the hon. gentleman repeat what he saw in the press?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is an evasion of the rule.

Mr. LENNOX. Then let us have a ruling on that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order. I want Mr. Speaker to say whether he rules that an hon. gentleman cannot repeat what he sees in the press?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gunn) was called to order for attempting to refer to proceedings which are still pending before the Committee of Agriculture. That attempt on his part having been ruled out of order, he then proposes to read a quotation from the public press to the same effect. I rule that this is an attempt to evade the former ruling and is still out of order.

Mr. LENNOX. And he cannot do it; very good.

Mr. INGRAM. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to place on record the report of the Committee of Agriculture adopted by this House:

Mr. McKenzie, from the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, presented the fourth report of the said committee, which is as follows:

The committee submit herewith, for the information of the House, the evidence of Mr. James A. Smart, taken in the current session of parliament, upon immigration to Canada, in connection with the promotion thereof by the North Atlantic Trading Company.

(For the evidence accompanying this report, see appendix to the Journals No. 2.)

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not see that that changes the matter. The committee has reported the evidence of one witness upon a subject which is still being investigated by the committee and therefore the matter is still before the committee.

Mr. GUNN.

Mr. STOCKTON. I most certainly do not agree with the position taken by the First Minister. The evidence taken before that committee has been reported to the House; the House is now in possession of it and is entitled to discuss it. With all due respect to my right hon. friend, his suggestion is contrary to the rule, and if he consults parliamentary practice he will find I am right.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. May I be permitted to interject—the reason that the committee was to report the evidence of a witness as soon as concluded was, that evidence might be used in the House, and the First Minister knows it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know it. I bow with great respect to the experience of my hon. friend (Mr. Stockton) and if he is able to quote me the authority showing I am wrong I will be the first to withdraw my objection.

Mr. FISHER. The motion in the committee, that the evidence of a witness as soon as given shall be reported to the House, was moved in regard to the evidence of witnesses from the Agriculture Department; and for the purpose of enabling that evidence to be distributed to the farmers of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the evidence is properly in possession of the House, quotations can be made from it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. That fact was not impressed upon my attention in the first place, but that is the rule.

Mr. GUNN. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asked Mr. Smart if he could tell who constituted this North Atlantic Trading Company, and Mr. Smart replied that he could. Then the hon. member (Mr. Monk) asked: Will you kindly tell me who they are, and Mr. Smart absolutely refused to tell who composed that company. I am glad to see the chairman of that committee (Mr. Peter Mackenzie) in his seat; I know him probably better than many hon. gentlemen in this House know him, and I do not believe he did himself justice when he made that ruling in the Committee of Agriculture. Of course the committee upheld him by a vote of 24 to 20 and so Mr. Smart was not obliged to answer the question. Now, I want to point out this: I believe there was nothing in the contract that was not what it should be; I believe there was nothing in the contract but what will bear the light of day, and if that be the case I cannot conceive why the members of this House should desire to suppress information that every taxpayer in this country should know in order to be able to de-