

his speech. But he reported nothing about the united nations in the remainder of his speech. I refer hon. members to the report in *Hansard*. He does say something about the anti-defamation league. Let me tell you something about the anti-defamation league. This is a Jewish institution organized in the United States. It never crossed the Canadian border and it will not cross the Canadian border, because Jewish interests in the United States are not the same as Jewish interests in Canada. We have learned to serve one God in one way, but we respect the nation that gives us asylum and gives us a home and liberty. So if an American Jew finds his interests contradictory to those of a Canadian Jew, we cannot march along together. This anti-defamation league is supposed to have given a statement which was reproduced in the *Ottawa Journal*:

... as saying that Jaques had addressed "nationalist" rallies in various parts of the United States recently with Gerald L. K. Smith, leader of the newly organized Christian nationalist crusade. Smith told a conference here yesterday—

That was in New York.

—that the crusade's ten-point programme includes preservation of the United States as a Christian nation, exposure of communism, and the "safeguarding of America against the menace of bureaucratic fascism."

We all agree with that. The United States can have any religion it likes. So can Canada. It is the individual right of every person. It can have its ideology. It can have its own political system. What does the hon. member say?

I may say that my reply to the press locally was as follows:

The Zionist terrorists—

And so on.

Now, I ask hon. members to take *Hansard*. I do not want to read the whole thing. Not a word was mentioned in the first quotation about zionism or terrorism. But what does he do by that sophistry? Like a demagogue, he finishes a sentence quoting something, then interjects something else which has no relationship whatsoever to the two former quotations. The hon. member said in the house that the mob and the people do not understand. He is the only free man. The mob is not responsible and he is going to show them the way. So I say to you, first of all, the anti-defamation league may also be anti-zionist.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but it is eleven o'clock.

Mr. HARTT: May I adjourn the debate?

[Mr. Hartt.]

Mr. KNOWLES: You have already spoken for forty-five minutes.

Mr. HARTT: I know that, but I want to bargain.

Mr. WEIR: May I adjourn the debate?

On motion of Mr. Weir the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, May 16, 1947

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE

MR. CLAXTON—REFERENCE TO STATEMENT OF MR. RAYMOND IN DEBATE ON MAY 15

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. Speaking in the house yesterday the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond) at page 3108 of *Hansard* cited *L'Action Catholique* of December 16 as having quoted me as saying:

(Translation):

Through its proposals, the dominion government is trying to place the provinces in such a position that they might relinquish their constitutional responsibilities.

(Text):

Had the hon. member looked at *L'Action Catholique* for the next day, that is the 17th of December, he would have seen a correction, showing that I did not say anything of the kind but said almost exactly the reverse. Because this is a matter of some importance, and as the hon. member based a considerable part of his speech on this translation—or mis-translation—I know he would be the first to admit his own surprise at my ever expressing the view he credited me with, and I should like to quote from *L'Action Catholique* for December 17, as follows:

(Translation):

It does seem that a faulty translation by a contemporary has caused us to do an injustice to Hon. Mr. Claxton. We had been sent a newspaper clipping which ascribed to the Minister of Health a statement which was the opposite of what he actually said. As a matter of fact, one of our readers assures us that he has the English text. Mr. Claxton had used the verb "discharge" which the translator rendered by the expression "se défaire" (to get rid of), instead of using the proper term "s'acquitter." The minister was asserting that the offers made by the dominion to the provinces would enable