

no hon. member may cast reflections upon the justice or decorum of the members of the committee, or suggest that they will not properly carry out their duties as members of the committee. No such reflection may be cast upon any members of a committee or of the house, and I ask all hon. members to refrain from such statements.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On the point of order, in effect Your Honour has ruled that no member may impute motives, and with that I am in agreement. But to dispute the decision of a committee and say that it is unjust, or may be unjust, is well within the rights of any hon. member.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has said that to dispute the findings of a committee or to say they may be so-and-so is quite legitimate. That is not what at least three hon. members have said in the hearing of this house this afternoon. Their statement has been that a committee of this house will not deal impartially with a certain question. That is the point of the statement that has been made; that is the intent of it, that justice cannot be expected from a committee of this house. Certainly that is a reflection upon the personnel of committees of this house, which no hon. member has a right to make. I do submit that we are losing sight entirely of what should be uppermost in the mind of every member of parliament; that is, to have his own privileges protected to the greatest extent possible. If the privileges of members are not fully protected the work of parliament under the democratic system cannot be carried on in a manner which will carry with it the support of public opinion. And every member who rises in his place and reflects upon another member's integrity, or the integrity of a committee of this house, is helping to undermine the true principles of democracy on which our parliamentary institutions are founded. I submit that Your Honour cannot be too rigid in insisting that where members do cast reflections upon other members, they be obliged to withdraw immediately. This whole case, of which so much is being said in the house, is the result of a lot of loose talking and of reflections by some hon. members upon others, which has been permitted to take place time and again. Had it been summarily dealt with at the outset it would probably not have resulted in the last incident.

Mr. BLACKMORE: On the point of order, when the hon. member for Battle River made his remarks, hon. members in other parts of the house were making so much noise that it was impossible to hear what the hon. member

[Mr. Speaker.]

for Battle River was saying. I ask the Prime Minister if he thinks that hon. members of his party were granting the hon. member for Battle River justice and freedom. Were they granting justice to the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains, in whose behalf the hon. member for Battle River was at that time speaking?

Mr. HANSELL: May we get on with the discussion of the motion?

An hon. MEMBER: What about getting on with the war?

Mr. LACOMBE: On a question of privilege—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already drawn to the attention of hon. members the terms of standing order 41, namely that no member shall make offensive remarks against any other member of the house. There have been offensive remarks made to-day. They are not confined to one person, or two; because three hon. members have said that it would not in their judgment be justice to the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains if this matter were sent to a committee. These remarks are wholly out of order, and they should be withdrawn. I ask that the hon. member for Battle River withdraw his remarks so far as they reflect upon hon. members of the house who are members of committees.

Mr. FAIR: I am bound to withdraw, and I do withdraw. But I want to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. FAIR: —that my remark was that the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains would not get the same treatment in a committee as he would in a court of justice.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (MacLeod): Mr. Speaker, it is true, as you have said, that the apparent charge of the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains is a serious one. I recognize that, if I read correctly the English translation as recorded in *Hansard* of last Friday. But the motion now before the house is also very serious. Every hon. member in the house is placed in the position of having to take his stand on this motion, and having to weigh in his mind whether there is a possibility of a private member being, shall I say, put into absolute political oblivion, or permitted to retain his seat. That is the position in which every hon. member is placed, and that is what every hon. member must decide when he votes upon this motion.

I am wondering if such a motion may not be interpreted as even casting a little reflection