

*Question of Privilege*

the hon. member that motives are imputed is entirely without foundation.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Citation 154, paragraph 6, of Beauchesne, fourth edition, is very clear. It reads as follows:

The words "purchased by legislation" applied to a member of the house are unparliamentary. An appeal was taken from this decision of Speaker Lemieux who was sustained by a vote of 87 to 71.

The reference given for that citation takes one to February 8, 1926, when a Conservative member of that day, Mr. Sutherland of South Oxford, referred to the then member of Winnipeg North Centre, Mr. Woodsworth, and his support of certain things the government of that day was bringing in by using the phrase "purchased by legislation". The clear implication of the words used by Mr. Sutherland was that Mr. Woodsworth and others associated with him were voting in support of things the government was bringing in because they had got certain things from the government of that day.

Mr. Woodsworth raised a point of order and the matter was debated at some length. Mr. Speaker Lemieux ruled very clearly that to say that a member's vote was purchased by legislation was out of order, and he called upon the member to apologize and withdraw. The ruling by Mr. Speaker Lemieux was appealed by Mr. Meighen and the ruling was sustained by a vote of 87 to 71. Mr. Speaker Lemieux then called on Mr. Sutherland to withdraw the remark he had made.

It took debate extending over a couple of pages of *Hansard* for this to be achieved but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the precedent is a clear one; and that a former member having been told by the Speaker that he must withdraw any suggestion that a member's support had been purchased by legislation applies today, so you, sir, should rule that the Leader of the Opposition should withdraw or apologize for the statement he has made about members of this house.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve):** Mr. Speaker, before you give your decision on the point of order just raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), I should like to say a few words on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas).

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) really did make the statement attributed to him concerning the members of the three minority groups in this house, to the effect that the indemnity increase voted last year is one reason why those three minority parties vote with the government to maintain the government in office, in order to avoid a general election, I want to say that I dissociate myself entirely from that statement of the Leader of the Opposition.

In view of the important post he holds at the present time, I am of the opinion that he made last night's statement without thinking or through lack of competence or honesty.

As far as we, in this corner of the house, are concerned, we voted more often against the government than for it, political partisanship aside. We voted according to our conscience, in the interest of the Canadian people. We voted, at times, with the government, but when it came to voting against it, we did not shirk our responsibility.

The Leader of the Opposition is free to make a spectacle of himself in Toronto, but he certainly has no right to do so at the expense of the three groups which sit to his left.

Furthermore, I wish to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that some of his own followers in the house do not share his views and that they are the first ones to condemn such boasting and say that they personally disagree with such statements as he made yesterday in Toronto.

**Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency):** Mr. Speaker, just a few words to say that I am in complete agreement with the remarks made by members of the smaller opposition parties.

Personally, I introduced in the house a bill affording all members the opportunity to refuse their indemnity raise, if they so wished.

I can therefore say, on behalf of the members of my party and myself, that the indemnity raise never had any bearing on any decision we were called upon to make in the past. If there are some who are opposed to the bill, if it is ever introduced, I would ask them to vote against it.

[*Text*]

**Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** I am rising on a point of personal privilege to say that I do not propose to sit quietly under a slanderous lie stated by any preposterous mountebank who will seize upon anything in his desperation; and that