

Privilege—Mr. Church

And that the resolution passed by the house on the 7th September, 1945, referring certain estimates to the committee of supply, be rescinded in so far as the said resolution relates to votes Nos. 377, 378 and 421.

Mr. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether this motion does not require notice?

Mr. CHEVRIER: This is the usual motion that follows the establishment of the committee on government-owned shipping. It is usually brought down a day or two after the committee has been set up.

Mr. STIRLING: But does it not require notice?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It can be done only by consent.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—MR. CHURCH

RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING COMMITTEE— REFERENCE TO PRESS REPORT OF DEBATE OF OCTOBER 16

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I wish to direct the attention of Your Honour and the house to a libelous Canadian Press dispatch dated October 16, in this morning's *Globe and Mail*. It quotes only one line from about nine paragraphs that I said, and I did not even say that. I was objecting to the method of reviewing railway policies. It says that the setting up of the committee on government-owned railways was opposed by me. That is not correct. When the motion was made for the setting up of the committee I knew that the motion was debatable but I was ruled out of order when I started to speak to the motion. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) has always been a fine supporter of the railway employees and their war work, and I am sure that my hon. friend for Rosetown-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell), who also referred to this, wishes to be fair. They will note that on September 11, speaking in the house, I was the first to pay tribute this session to the transportation employees of Canada as reported at page 88 of *Hansard*, in these words:

I wish to say a word by way of tribute to the transportation employees of Canada, whether they serve on land, at sea or in the air. I was talking the other day to a conductor on a train who told me he had been working eighteen hours a day continuously. These employees have made a magnificent record in this war and should receive ample compensation and reward and all other allowances for a fine work well performed.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

I have always, in this house, been a supporter of public ownership of the railways run from the commercial point of view, and not from the point of view of politics. I would call the attention of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan to the fact that I have never, as this article says, had day by day criticism of the Canadian National Railway system. I think he will be fair enough to admit that I have a record for consistently working in this house on behalf of the railway employees and for the system being run from the commercial aspect and free of politics. I just want to keep the record straight. Further, I said the motion was made subject to the right of the committee of supply as to the voting of public moneys.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we need protection from some of the press, because according to our rules a libel on a member is a libel on the whole house of which he is a member. I have the strongest grounds for protesting against this garbled report of what I said in the house.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggan): Mr. Speaker, may I say just a word? I had no intention of reflecting upon what the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) said, but I was most anxious to place before the house the point of view that we should refrain from allowing politics to enter into the operation of these government-owned organizations.

TAXATION

INQUIRY FOR REPORTS OF ROYAL COMMISSIONS

On the order for motions:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before leaving motions I would ask the indulgence of the house to direct a question to the acting Minister of Finance. It is a question that I might ask on the orders of the day, but we may not reach them to-day as this is private members' day. I think the question is important enough for me to raise it now. It has to do with the tabling of two reports that were referred to by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilesley) in his budget speech, as reported at page 1007 of *Hansard*, and also referred to by him in answer to a question by the hon. member for Queens (Mr. McLure). The reports are those of the royal commission on the taxation of cooperatives and the royal commission on the taxation of annuities and family corporations. On September 27 the Minister of Finance, in reply to a question by the hon. member for Queens, indicated that the report of the royal commission on the taxation of cooperatives had been received by