

*Privilege—Mr. Lapointe (Lotbinière)*

we can do this to-night, but agree unanimously that it will be the last occasion upon which the closing rule will be violated.

Motion (Mr. Perley) agreed to and debate adjourned.

#### THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

Ottawa, February 4, 1943.

Sir, I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Thibaudeau Rinfret, acting as deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the senate chamber on Friday the fifth of February at 3 p.m., for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

F. L. C. Pereira,

Assistant Secretary to the  
Governor General.

On motion of Mr. Crerar, the house adjourned at 10.27 p.m.

#### Friday, February 5, 1943

The house met at three o'clock.

#### THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Major A. R. Thompson, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour, the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the house went up to the Senate.

And having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the house that the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name royal assent to the following bill:

An act to amend an act respecting the Chief Justice of Canada.

#### PRIVILEGE

MR. LAPOINTE (LOTBINIÈRE)—REFERENCE IN DEBATE ON FEBRUARY 4 TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SERVING IN ARMED FORCES

Mr. HUGUES LAPOINTE (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege to protest against the remarks made last evening by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) with regard to hon. members of this house who are serving at the present time in his majesty's forces. On

[Mr. Crerar.]

that occasion the hon. member, according to *Hansard*, made two statements. First, he said:

I do not think anyone has the right to create the impression, consciously or unconsciously, that some particular member or members exclusively represent in this house the armed forces.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that when any hon. member in uniform addresses this house on military matters he is considered as representing or is trying to create the impression that he represents the armed forces in the sense that he has a mandate from them. But it so happens that from the very nature of his duties in His Majesty's service he is often better qualified to know just what are the conditions and circumstances in the army, and it is not only his privilege but his duty to express himself in the house.

As regards the hon. member's second statement, that he did not think it was possible at the present time for an hon. member to discharge his duties both as an officer of his majesty—

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): What is the point of order?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, have I the right to state the point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. COLDWELL: My understanding is that a member may rise to a question of privilege affecting the person, but in this case we are listening to a speech. To that I have no objection, but in my opinion it is not in accordance with the rules of the house. The statement might well be made in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is far more serious than any question of privilege affecting individuals. It affects the whole constitution of this assembly of parliament. The statement that was made was a reflection upon hon. members who have been privileged to serve in the uniform of his majesty in this war, therefore the question which has been raised is the most serious question of privilege which could be brought before this parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not wish that there should be a debate on the question of privilege, because that is not allowed under the rules of the house. But the hon. member as a matter of privilege is replying to a state-