

question of privilege the reading, with comments upon them, of lengthy newspaper articles.

Mr. SPEAKER: Bourinot is very clear on this subject. He says:

When a member conceives himself to have been misunderstood in some material part of his speech he is invariably allowed, through the indulgence of the house, to explain with respect to the part so misunderstood.

He concludes the paragraph by urging that such explanations be brief.

Mr. BIRD: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, a much more serious matter for a member of this house to have his standing before the public, especially in relation to his religious convictions, scurrilously slandered in the manner adopted by these newspapers. Surely I can claim the protection of the house from that kind of thing. These articles attempt to brand me in the eyes of my fellow-religionists as being unworthy of the name I profess and of the profession I have followed for a good many years. I desire to call the attention of the house to what I actually said on the occasion in question. When this matter was before the house I was careful to make my point of view clear. I had not intended to speak to the bill at all; I knew nothing about it. But when my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Geary), perhaps unintentionally, cast an imputation upon my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre, I rose and at once explained why I took part in the discussion. I said:

Now, I take part in this discussion in order to protect my friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) from what I consider to be the unjust objection of my friend from South Toronto (Mr. Geary).

Mr. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I again rise to a point of order. This is nothing more or less than an attempt to justify the participation of the hon. member in some debate, and I suggest that if his words on that occasion were not considered by the house to be sufficient justification for his stand, the matter should be allowed to drop.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already said that these explanations must be brief, but at the same time in justice to the hon. member I must remind the house that Bourinot says that in all cases of personal grievance the house will frequently cast aside rigid adherence to established usage in order to permit a full explanation to be made. I think the comments made by the hon. member justify him in explaining his attitude to the house, but I again call upon him to be as brief as possible, because time is precious.

Mr. BIRD: I am just following the example set as recently as yesterday by a much more experienced parliamentarian than myself. On that occasion the hon. member's opinions were under attack, while in this case my character is being assailed. Any hon. member can read my few remarks through and see at once that I have been grossly slandered and misrepresented. It is my view of religion that when a friend of mine seems to be suffering under an unjust imputation, I should immediately come to his aid, and I would also say as the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) said yesterday, that there should be some protection for hon. members of this house against attacks of this kind. If there is one kind of blasphemy worse than another it is not the blasphemy of the soap box atheist who shouts on the street corner, but rather the blasphemy of the man who poses as a champion of religion, and while in that pose makes an uncalled-for attack upon the character of another man.

Mr. HOCKEN: Perhaps these editors wrote inadvertently.

PRIVILEGE—MR. ADSHEAD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, I also rise to a question of privilege, but it is quite different from that raised by my hon. friend from Nelson (Mr. Bird). In addressing myself to the house yesterday I made the statement that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) had addressed a meeting in Calgary, during the course of which he stated that \$30,000,000 had been saved to corporations by his tax reductions, and that that saving was passed on the men below. The Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance were both present at that meeting, and they have drawn my attention to the fact that I entirely misunderstood the remarks of the minister. It was quite unintentional, and I assure hon. members of the house that I had no desire to misquote my hon. friend. Therefore, accepting their statements as I do, I withdraw that portion of my address which relates to that particular statement made by the Minister of Finance.

PRIVILEGE—MR. GARLAND (BOW RIVER)

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. Yesterday the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) is reported at page 715 of Hansard to have said:

The hon. member for Bow River tried to hoodwink me when he wanted the support of Ontario to the subsidizing of the railways in the matter of bringing coal from Alberta.