

to call the hon. member to order, further that he be asked to withdraw the offensive words which he has just uttered, and that he be reminded that the debates of this house must not be disparaged by personal remarks.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, I wish to state that the hon. member did not mention any member of the house in particular, and that he has a perfect right to comment upon previous speeches. The hon. member who opened this debate made no personal reference to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Boulanger)—

Mr. BOULANGER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GAUTHIER (Translation): One speech on a point of order ought to be enough.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): If you will permit me, I shall quote the rule to which I have just referred in English, because I have not the French version before me. Here is what rule 41 says:

No member shall speak disrespectfully of His Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family; nor of the governor or person administering the government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either house, or against any member thereof. No member may reflect upon any vote of the house, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

And a little further, at page 97 of *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, number 207:

The imputation of bad motives different from those acknowledged, misrepresenting the language of another or accusing him, in his turn, of misrepresentation, charging him with falsehood or deceit; or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind; all these are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference.

While addressing the house, the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Gauthier) stated clearly that those who did not share his views—

Mr. GAUTHIER (Translation): It is untrue.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): —that those who expressed opinions contrary to his own were probably actuated by personal motives and were likely seeking some reward for the services which they rendered the Liberal party. That is what I am objecting to, Mr. Speaker, and I ask that the member be called to order, and furthermore that he be asked to withdraw his statements.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, I consider that it would be most unfair to call the hon. member to order. The house will divide,

[Mr. Boulanger.]

either to-night or to-morrow or later, on this motion which has been presented by the hon. member for Vancouver North.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Translation): Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order—

Mr. SPEAKER (Translation): I do not think that the hon. member for Portneuf, in the course of his remarks, has mentioned the name of the hon. member for Bellechasse. I listened to him attentively, and while there was some noise in the house, I do not think that his remarks can be construed as being meant for any particular member of the house who has previously spoken on this question.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Translation): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the motion of the hon. member for Vancouver North, I had no other purpose than that of expressing openly my views, and I am sure that they will be respected as much as I respect those of others. May I hope, sir, that the stand I am taking will be well understood by my political leaders, whom I still trust, even though I may not share their views on the advisability of increasing these estimates, also by those who are from another race than my own, and by others whose political faith is different from that to which I boast to belong since I entered public life.

I was born, and I live in a French-Canadian province which is part of the Canadian confederation. Although proud of being a French-Canadian, I am proud also of being a citizen of Canada. And I dare believe that following the observations I wish to offer to this house, I shall have no apology to make, no regret, and that I shall still have the satisfaction of being able to face my compatriots, whether in the province of Quebec or in any other province of this dominion.

The motion of the hon. member may be divided into two parts, for the object of this discussion. Thus the first one:

This house views with grave concern the startling increases of expenditure proposed by the government for purposes of national armament—

And the second one:

—in contrast with the inadequate provision for the social security of all sections of the Canadian people.

Judging by the several speeches which have been delivered in this house, it is clear that the majority do not consider this increase as being unreasonable; on the contrary, that it is necessary and that it is our urgent duty to support it with all the strength of which a real patriot is capable. A smaller number of hon. members believe that we are not