

I mention this simply to show the wrong that we have done to men of this class by excluding the right of appeal which the Commons offered to them, owing to the statements so positively made to us yesterday, that they were already fully provided for, and also to support the statements which I made, as of my personal knowledge, that cases like this occur and are not provided for.

There is another point to which I wish to take exception. I have not understood that courtesy in debate has become merely a legend in this Chamber. I have thought it was one of the distinguishing marks of the Senate, and so far as I am concerned I have endeavoured to comport myself with that in mind. I think I said nothing yesterday provocative of any unkind rejoinder from any source; yet I see this from no less a person than the leader of the Senate.

Hon. Mr. Dandurand: A statement which he did not volunteer, but which the Committee asked of him.

Hon. Mr. Griesbach: I myself asked.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, he volunteered his attendance there for the purpose of being asked.

Hon. Mr. Dandurand: Yes, with other members of the Commons Committee. I pity my honourable friend's state of mind.

If that is in accordance with the courtesy of debate which is supposed to rule in this Chamber, or to have ruled, then I fail to understand what courtesy is. In my opinion it is a most improper statement, which should have been challenged and recalled when made. I myself resent it. I might have reflected—I do not intend to reflect now—on the mentality of my honourable friend, in the attitude he took in connection with the matter then under discussion. I did not do so. I said nothing provocative, and I think it should not pass unnoticed that an unseemly remark of this kind was made by the leader of the Senate respecting a man who had done nothing to cause it.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Honourable gentlemen, I confess that I was somewhat adversely affected by the attitude of my honourable friend yesterday; and since he refers to what was passed in this Chamber I have no objection to explain to him how my sentiment was expressed in perhaps too abrupt a manner. I felt, and I still feel, that the Senate of Canada has a duty to perform. We are a revising body, and the more we do so with a clear detachment from party passions the better this country will be.

Hon. Mr. POPE: Order. Don't be annoyed.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: We have addressed ourselves to the solution of a most difficult problem, that of pensions to soldiers. I think we have done so in a way deserving commendation from the members of the House of Commons who came by invitation to the sittings of our Committee. Now, I believe that my honourable friend in the debate yesterday sinned against two rules which should govern members of the Senate. He enlarged upon what had taken place in Committee. The rule is that there should be no statement as to the incidents in Committee, and that rule is obviously just, because there are no shorthand writers to take down exactly all that is said.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: Honourable gentlemen will remember that I called attention to that, and asked that I might be checked if I were transgressing the rules. I may say that I have not found any rule except that forbidding reference to proceedings in a committee until they have reported. I had a suspicion that there was one, and I invited challenge yesterday, but there was no challenge.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Well, documents which were brought to the Committee may be referred to. I abstained from stating what had been my action as representative of the Government in the Committee, as to motions that I had made and that had been rejected. I abstained from doing that because I wanted the work of that Committee, and the result of that work, to be the product of the whole Committee, and I bowed to the decisions of the Committee.

My honourable friend went one step further, by singling out one of the gentlemen, whom we had invited with other members of the Commons, to attend our sittings; and he stated that the reason he mentioned the presence of that Minister was that he might share the responsibility with us in the decision we had taken. He also mentioned the political or party effect which it would have. I confess that that displeased me, and I believe it displeased a number of other members of the Senate. Now, it was unfair to put that Minister in that position, because the whole situation had not been stated. What was the situation? The situation was that suggestions had come from the other Chamber—

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: If I might interrupt the honourable gentleman, I would have liked to discuss that matter myself, but I realized that I could not do so on a question of privilege. Now, if the honourable gentleman is going to discuss the position of the Minister on a question of privilege, I would like the opportunity to discuss it also.