

*National Defence Act Amendment*

The Chairman: I am always at the disposal of the committee and I will call for a vote on that from those who will meet here this afternoon.

Mr. Churchill: No, no, you cannot call for a vote, sir. You have to have a motion.

An hon. Member: I move that we adjourn until 2 p.m.

Get a load of this:

The Chairman: We have a motion. Now gentlemen, we have business to do. I have no motion in front of me, gentlemen—

First there is a motion, then there is no motion. I continue reading:

An hon. Member: You have a motion.

The Chairman: —and the bells are ringing. We have been meeting regularly at this period and we should be here this afternoon—

Mr. Churchill: That is your decision.

The Chairman: —at two o'clock to deal with this.

Mr. Churchill: That is your ruling arbitrarily arrived at.

Mr. Lambert: It has not been the regular practice to meet Friday afternoon, although there has been the odd meeting. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, what you are doing is asking those people on this side of the chair to absorb the brunt of what happened yesterday afternoon, the long division bells.

The Chairman: Gentlemen, the House of Commons itself was involved in that. Gentlemen, two o'clock.

One can go through the proceedings and nowhere on March 3 will one find anything to corroborate the statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra when he lied to the house that day by saying, "I asked for a show of hands." The evidence does not support that. Now the hon. member for Kootenay East is supporting the same lie supported by the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. Knowles: Order, please.

The Chairman: Order, please. Sufficient has been said for the Chair to rule on the point of order. Far be it for the occupant of the Chair to lecture the committee on parliamentary language, but I suggest to the committee, and this applies to all parties, that more care ought to be taken in confining language to those statements and phrases usually considered parliamentary.

May, seventeenth edition, says at page 455:

Allegations against Members.—Good temper and moderation are the characteristics of parliamentary language. Parliamentary language is never more desirable than when a member is canvassing the opinions and conduct of his opponents in debate.

With reference to the point of order now before the committee, citation 154(3) of Beauchesne, fourth edition, says:

The imputation of bad motives, or 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.

Citation 154(5) says:

It is not unparliamentary to say that a statement is untrue, but it is unparliamentary to say that it was untrue to the knowledge of the member addressing the House.

I say to the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona that the Chair and the committee would be appreciative if he could co-operate and use language more within the confines of that considered to be parliamentary.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I am always willing to co-operate with the Chair. The entire purpose of my speech today is to point out the reliance of the minister and his supporters on arguments which have been disproved by facts.

An hon. Member: Boloney.

Mr. Nugent: I trust that the sensibilities and sensitiveness of hon. members on the government side will restrain them while I remind them of certain things. I wish to read from the Ottawa *Citizen* of last Friday, April 14. An article by Charles King is headed, "It's Time To End The Row On Unification." Under the subheading, "They're Reactionary", Mr. King says:

There is no doubt—there never has been—that a great many serving officers, and perhaps some of the men they order about in feudal fashion, don't like the assignment parliament is giving them.

That is too bad. It would be nicer to think that they were behind the government on this, recognizing the inevitability of change, and the supremacy of parliament in these matters.

But the army and the navy, and to some degree the air force as well, have always been somewhat reactionary in their attitudes, leaning heavily toward tradition, pomp, and regimental finery.

I would think that the members of the defence committee as well as the Minister of National Defence might rise in wrath against such an article. The allegations against those who testified before the committee—Generals Moncel and Fleury, Air Marshals Miller and Annis, Admirals Landymore and Brock, etc.—are clear. But I did not hear any annoyance expressed on the other side of the house at these gentlemen being so insulted. Members who sat on the committee will recall the