

Privilege—Mr. Weaver

previously prepared essays. With that I am in full agreement, but at the moment that is not the point.

Here is the point to be considered at the moment. This is a statement re the assistance given by the mines branch in developing treatments of Flin Flon complex sulphide ore and Flin Flon disseminated ore. The hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Weaver) made a speech the other day. As hon. members know, he is by profession a metallurgist. He discussed the very matters that are mentioned in this statement which was prepared by the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. On the following day, or perhaps the same day, the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nicholson) made reference to this statement and quoted from it. The hon. member for Churchill rises in his place today and says that in fairness to the house and to himself the statement, which he considers was referred to inadequately by the hon. member for Mackenzie, should be placed on *Hansard*. That is the point, and I think it is quite different from that which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) has made. This statement cannot be put on *Hansard* unless there is unanimous consent.

Mr. Coldwell: There is not.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggarr): Mr. Speaker, I do not think unanimous consent should be given to this. As a matter of fact the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) and I had a dispute with reference to some quotation the other evening. Am I permitted, in order to substantiate a statement I may make, to put a file or a book on the record of the house? I think we should stick to our time-honoured practice of not extending the record. While I sympathize with the idea behind this, I think probably the hon. gentleman could do it in a speech on mines and resources or something of that sort. I would not be prepared to give my consent to it, on the ground that I would be giving it without knowing what was in the document.

Mr. Rodney Adamson (York West): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. gentleman should be allowed to continue with the statement. One of the engineers of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys prepared a report, of which only part was read to this house. In my opinion that gave a false impression as to the context of the entire report. The hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Weaver), who is a metallurgist, felt that his judgment and his statement had

[Mr. Speaker.]

been called in question, not by the report but by the excerpt of the report given to this house. I think in fairness to both gentlemen, the gentleman who wrote the report and the hon. member for Churchill, the report in its entirety should be on the record of this house.

Mr. Speaker: I still must ask the house if it gives unanimous consent to have this statement printed on *Hansard*. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Some hon. members say "no". Therefore it cannot be put on *Hansard*.

Mr. McIlraith: On a point of order, now that there is no—

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order on a question of privilege. If the hon. member for Churchill wants to substantiate further his question of privilege he may do so.

An hon. Member: Read it.

Mr. Weaver: This report is a very fair report of the circumstances and I would have been glad to stand on it. However, since the house has not given me unanimous consent to place it on *Hansard* I shall make just a few remarks.

An hon. Member: Read it.

Mr. McIvor: Read the whole thing.

Mr. Weaver: This is a statement re the assistance given by the mines branch in developing treatments of Flin Flon complex sulphide ore and Flin Flon disseminated ore, and it reads:

The following is quoted from mines branch report of investigations in 1921, No. 589, from investigation (test) No. 142 on "The Flin Flon complex sulphide ore", page 100:

"In June, 1920, application was made by the Mining Corporation of Canada, who hold the option on the property, (subsequently Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co. Limited) to the department of mines for assistance in solving the metallurgical problems in connection with the treatment of the sulphide ore. Later this was extended to cover the disseminated ore."

Investigations on the treatment of the sulphide ore were carried out in 1921 and a report issued. This was published in No. 589 mines branch report.

In 1922, investigations were carried out on the treatment of the disseminated ore and another report issued, making recommendations for four different flowsheets to be tested by pilot runs. This report was published in mines branch report of investigations in 1922, No. 608. In conclusion lines were proposed along which research should be continued. It is interesting to note that three of those lines of research proposed the removal of talc first in order to make the flotation of Flin Flon ore efficient. A reference to this will be made later on.

The results obtained by the mines branch investigations were very encouraging. As is stated in the report (No. 589, pages 112-113):