

Pension Act

during the summer of the act by all parties interested. The associated veterans, however, are of the opinion that no time should be lost in appointing this committee and they are prepared immediately to meet together and name their representatives. In conclusion we wish to thank this government and its predecessors in office and the parliament of Canada for its kindness and consideration in days gone by and at the present time and to assure them that the ex-service men of this country to-day as in the days from 1914 to 1918 are willing to do everything in their power to assure the peace, order, and good government of Canada.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

(Sgd.) J. S. Roper,

Dominion President, Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League on behalf of the Associated Veterans named in the body of this letter.

Mr. CAMERON R. McINTOSH (North Battleford): May I say I listened to the reply of the Minister of Pensions and National Health, and I want to thank him for the definite and satisfactory answer that he has given to the many questions asked him this session in connection with pensions and returned men. But I should like to ask him whether, when the committee is appointed for next session, soldier settlers will be included by the government in the investigation?

Mr. MacLAREN: No; this subject does not come under the purview of the investigation.

Mr. McINTOSH: I might say that it was connected with the pension question in 1930, and I should like to impress upon the minister the importance of not overlooking the interests of the soldier settlers next year when the question is investigated.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not the right to make a speech.

Mr. McINTOSH: It is not my intention to make a speech.

PURCHASE OF FERTILIZER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. ROBERT WEIR (Minister of Agriculture): In answer to a question asked on Friday last by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. MacLean), my information is that no such resolution has been received.

PRIVILEGE—MR. NEILL

APPEAL FROM RULING OF MR. SPEAKER—RULING SUSTAINED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I rise to a question of privilege under authority of [Mr. MacLaren.]

standing order 16 of Beausiesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, and also of Bourinot, pages 303 and 304. Both these authorities lay down the rule that any question of privilege must have a reference to a member of parliament and to his functioning as such. The matter I wish to take up very briefly comes under that definition, so I presume I am in order. On page 2295 of Hansard of April 22 will be found two definite misstatements, both concerning myself. Both are intended and one of them is calculated to prejudice my political record and reputation. The hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Barber) was referring to a debate in 1925 in connection with railway matters and he read to the extent of half a column the exact words of a speech made on that occasion by the present leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), then Prime Minister of Canada. A little later on he used these words, referring to me:

Well, the hon. member himself sat in this house during the session of 1925. I have gone very carefully through the debate to which I have referred—

Please note the Ultima Thule of caution. He had gone through it, not carefully, but very carefully.

—but I cannot find that he offered any suggestions to the then government, nor did he support the Conservative members from British Columbia who demanded justice for their province with respect to freight rates.

He then, to the extent of about half a column, bases on that statement an attack against me. My answer is that his statement is entirely wrong. I did speak in that debate—

Mr. SPEAKER: I call the hon. member to order. So far he has given the house nothing that indicates he is speaking to a question of privilege. I have looked up the debate to which he refers. The hon. member for Fraser Valley says:

I have gone very carefully through the debate to which I have referred, but I cannot find—
And so forth.

Mr. NEILL: But I am now going to proceed to show that is a gross misstatement.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member for Fraser Valley could not find certain things in a debate, that is no basis for a question of privilege on which the hon. member for Comox-Alberni could make a speech in refutation. What the hon. member for Fraser Valley said was fair criticism of another hon. member, and there may come a time in debate when the hon. member for Comox-Alberni can reply; but he cannot, on a question of privilege, make a speech in reply, as he is attempting to do now.