

National Defence Act Amendment

wipe it out. We are expected to look forward to an uncertain future and make fun of everything that happened in the past, make fun of the people in the services who have made such a contribution to Canadian life.

Mr. Groos: That is not so.

Mr. Churchill: Just to show how careless this government is with regard to tradition and recognition of the sacrifices of the past, I wish the Minister of Veterans Affairs were here this afternoon, the man who bungled the Vimy Ridge—

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Churchill: You can shout "shame" but let me tell you the story. He is the man who bungled the Vimy Ridge remembrance ceremony both in Europe and here in Canada, the man who did not give recognition to a representative of the Canadian Corps Association, who did not provide for a representative of the Canadian Corps Association to travel to Vimy Ridge with the regular party and who neglected the representative of the Canadian Corps Association here at the cenotaph ceremony. Yet the Canadian Corps Association was organized after the first world war and represents those divisions that fought at Vimy Ridge as well as other units. It has had a long and honourable history. But that is part of our tradition and therefore we are expected to forget it. The Minister of Veterans Affairs, like his colleagues, pays no attention to the past. He is not interested. He won't be bothered. This is the attention he gave to the ceremonies in remembrance of that famous battle.

● (3:20 p.m.)

I wish the derisive laughter could be recorded in *Hansard*. Members of the Liberal party laugh at such remarks about the Royal Canadian Navy and the Royal Canadian Air Force. They jeer at anyone who speaks of the history of this country and its traditions. All these things are to be wiped out.

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has the floor and I would invite members to make a little less noise during the time he is making his remarks.

Mr. Churchill: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I do not object to the derisive attention I receive from the Liberal members. I will not be discouraged from speaking in this chamber. I often stand up here to defend

[Mr. Churchill.]

freedom of speech. I will seize every opportunity to make my voice heard here in opposition to what the Liberal party is doing to this country. This is all part of a pattern which we meet day after day and week after week. Whether it has to do with the word "royal" or the coat of arms, everything in Canada's tradition is to be set to one side, laughed at and derided. I believe the Secretary of State has something to say and I should like to hear what it is.

Miss LaMarsh: What I should like to say is that the hon. gentleman has dishonoured the house several times. He has produced a phony letter and now, having sat in this house and having heard the explanation that the government of which he was a part was the only one which had anything to do with changing the coat of arms or its depictions, he tries to use what one of his own colleagues calls "the big lie" to change the record.

Mr. Churchill: We are doing well, Mr. Chairman. About ten days ago the Minister of Transport entered this debate. As I said, I thought his contribution was the silliest I had ever heard. It has been exceeded now by the contribution of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will now rise in her place and withdraw the accusation that I introduced into this house a phony letter. Mr. Chairman, I call upon you to protect the privileges of hon. members.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: The minister has to prove her case or withdraw her remarks. On a question of privilege, I ask that that be done.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order. I consider the remark made by the Secretary of State to be in fairly strong language, but I am not convinced that it is altogether unparliamentary.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, perhaps you did not hear the accusation. The Secretary of State said that I had introduced into the House of Commons a phony letter. I say that is an accusation to the effect that I did something dishonest or dishonourable. I say that the Secretary of State must withdraw that reflection or prove it. That is my point of privilege, sir. What phony letter did I introduce in this chamber? In what respect was it phony? That is the proof I want.