

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is already a point of order being stated by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BURY: I take the point of order on his raising the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader of the opposition is speaking to a question of privilege.

Mr. BURY: I am raising a point of order on the question of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should like to have an opportunity of saying something myself.

Mr. BURY: My point of order is on the question of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader of the opposition is speaking to a question of privilege, which is always in order. The hon. member for East Edmonton is rising to a point of order on the question of privilege. I think I must hear the point of order first.

Mr. BURY: My point of order is this, that the right hon. gentleman elected to make his statement to the house in the course of a debate on a motion for the repeal of section 98. He was allowed by your honour and the house to make his full, free statement on that debate and in that form. I am raising the point of order that he cannot now repeat on a question of privilege what he has already stated to the house in his speech in the course of the debate. He is trying to do again on a question of privilege exactly what he has already done in his speech during the debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot agree with the hon. member. If I have to decide that members who repeat what they have already said are out of order, I shall not have much rest. As long as an hon. member has not spoken for forty minutes, he may use as much of that time as he wishes, but he will be stopped by the forty minute rule.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My further point is that no hon. member is permitted to impute motives to another hon. member. I think your honour has already so ruled this afternoon. The following statement in the speech of the Solicitor General imputes motives and carries an implication which is not warranted. He said:

My question at the present time is this: Is the Liberal party having recourse to the same tactics in 1932 that it had recourse to in 1926? Are they paying a second price? That is my question.

I ask the Solicitor General to withdraw that statement.

[Mr. Bury.]

Mr. DUPRE: I am quite willing to answer and I claim the right to answer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The rule is clear that if an hon. member rises and says that some statement asserted against him by another hon. member is not correct, the other hon. member is bound to accept his word. The Solicitor General must accept the word of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. DUPRE: This is the interpretation that I had given and I still maintain as to the attitude taken by the Liberal party—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In all fairness, I think the Solicitor General should be allowed to explain what he meant, but I have ruled that he is bound to accept the word of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. DUPRE: What I meant is very plain, and it is on Hansard. I do not think I have anything to withdraw. I have the right to put a question to the leader of the opposition or to any hon. member around him. I asked him to state whether this was the price or not. The leader of the opposition is quite at liberty to give whatever answer he wishes. May I draw his attention to page 2335 of Hansard?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I rise to a point of order. I submit that the hon. gentleman has no more right to ask a question which imputes motives than to impute motives in a direct assertion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This seems to be a tempest in a teapot. The hon. member from Ottawa is right: the leader of the opposition has answered the statement made by the Solicitor General by saying that the assertions made by the Solicitor General are not correct, so far as the leader of the opposition is concerned, and one member must accept the word of another. Therefore I think the Solicitor General should gracefully withdraw the imputation he has made.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. DUPRE: I do not think I should withdraw. I believe I have a right to say what I think and I am not obliged to withdraw what I think.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think we should make a big question of this. One hon. member says that what another hon. member states about him is not correct. Such a statement of an hon. member has always been accepted. I think the Solicitor General is bound to accept the statement of the leader of the opposition.