

on behalf of the government of Canada. I do hope my hon. friend will be more careful about the statements he makes because I do not propose to let unfounded assertions go unchallenged.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, I am just as careful about the statements I make as is the hon. minister himself, and I am just as particular not to allow any statement of his to go unchallenged as he may be to challenge anything I say. So we might as well understand that just now.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I understand it.

Mr. IRVINE: I have as good authority for making the statements I have made as anyone can expect to have in this or any other country. If these wires to which I have referred are baseless then I must go back to those who sent them and tell them they are mistaken; also, if these newspaper reports are false, then we must advise the newspapers accordingly. But these are the authorities which I have, I have investigated them to the best of my ability, and I submit again that my statement in this regard is just as well founded as any statement which the minister has himself made.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend is very adroit at missing the point. He said these people were suffering. That is what I took exception to. Now he is slipping away from the suffering and dealing with dissatisfaction. I want my hon. friend to understand that he made a straight statement that these people were suffering, and I challenged that statement. I still challenge it and ask him to bring forward facts to show that anything of the kind has happened. Dissatisfaction is another matter altogether.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister himself has answered the question. He says I slip away from the point. I do not slip away from any point or any person. He says I charged that these men were suffering. Then he says they are not suffering, they are disappointed. Is not disappointment suffering? In the estimation of the minister can there be suffering more poignant than the disappointment of people who have come from their own land in response to appeals and promises, into what to them is a foreign country, only to find that they have been misinformed and befooled? Can anything be more keen than disappointment, or has the hon. minister no imagination? Can suffering not take place except someone sticks a pin into one or knocks one on the head? That is a crude concept of suffering. My conception covers a bigger

field. If you prove that these people have not suffered at all from want or cold, which has not been proven, there is no doubt that they have suffered and are still suffering in the keenest way from disappointment brought about by broken promises on the part of the government made in the name of the people in a new country. I conclude, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. IRVINE: I am very glad to notice, Mr. Speaker, that the government and its supporters have taken my remarks so keenly, because it proves to me that I am hitting the nail on the head, or to change the analogy, am getting under their skins. I wish they would be as particular in the future about their own statements and about investigating matters as I have been in this particular case. And I hope that the enthusiasm which they display against anyone who criticizes their policy will be switched into carrying their policy out in a positive manner. When that happens they will be doing a greater service to this country than they have yet accomplished, and we shall not have these people suffering as they are doing now. I say suffering, advisedly, Mr. Speaker, knowing that the mental suffering of these people is much keener than any physical suffering can possibly be. That is all I wish to say on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: In justice to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) who expressed a desire to reply, I would remind him that on a substantive motion only can a reply be made. If the hon. member will refer to paragraph 263 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms he will find the following definition of a substantive motion:

By a substantive motion is meant a motion not incidental to a proceeding before the House, and which can be dealt with by amendment or by the distinct vote of the House.

This motion for adjournment not being a substantive motion, a reply cannot be allowed. That is why I ruled out the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker.

Motion (Mr. Speakman) to adjourn withdrawn.

JUDGES ACT AMENDMENT

On the order:

That the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend section six of the Judges Act, as enacted by chapter fifty-six of the