

*Proposal for Time Allocation*

by the Creditistes it is safe for him and those associated with him to vote against it.

The article in the *Winnipeg Free Press* goes on to say:

The government can press on; that appears to be its intention. But if it does so at the expense of cutting further debate, it cannot help but leave the same kind of impression that the St. Laurent government left when it used closure in 1956—that here is a government which has failed to convince the majority of the population.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, they can gag us by brute force with the assistance of third parties, but they cannot gag our belief and that of millions of Canadians that what is being destroyed here is tradition, which the minister sweeps aside. He said, "What does it matter what your uniform is?" I am going to refer to his words in a moment when he gave his views on the processes that brought about this situation.

I now come to the explanation of the minister. From the beginning he has pursued a tortuous course. I have always had a rather warm feeling for him. While we sit opposite one another and express ourselves strongly in debate, there is still something within us that admires ability and capacity, and above all willingness, to do one's best for one's country. If I may make a diversion at this moment, Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring a simple example to the attention of the house. This happened in 1961. My wife and I were in London. We were invited to a dinner given in our honour by the prime minister of the United Kingdom. Sir Winston Churchill came that night. My wife sat between the prime minister and Sir Winston. I was on the other side of the table, away down. I had been introduced to all who were present there but I did not realize who the lady was next to me. Her name was Mrs. Chamberlain. I did not associate her in any way with the prime minister of the United Kingdom of the late 1930's and the early months of 1940. Sir Winston was in unusually good humour that night. I turned to her at one point and said: "Is it not wonderful the way he enjoys life at his age? He is happy tonight." She said: "Yes, if it weren't for him we wouldn't be here."

● (3:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Habel:** That is a bedtime story.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I know it registered nothing in the mind of the hon. gentleman. That is my idea of public life. Mrs. Chamberlain's

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

late husband was driven out but she maintained that tradition which is the essence of the British parliamentary system. The interference opposite indicates that the hon. members do not know parliament.

I have followed the minister's course with a great deal of interest but the manner in which he has given explanations to the house indicates that when he is faced with arguments he takes up another position. His first statement was that all the experts and all the servicemen were on his side.

**Mr. Hellyer:** I never said that.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That was proven to be completely without foundation. His second position was—

**Mr. Hellyer:** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman gave the impression he was quoting from something I said. Would he give the source and the time and place so I can find it?

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** It has been said over and over again. Those who did not agree were retired, so naturally he must have felt he had the unanimous support of those who were permitted to remain.

**Mr. Hellyer:** You paraphrased it.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** If the minister can name me one high officer who dared say he did not agree with unification and is not yet out of the services, I will give him the opportunity.

**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):** This is Hitler's birthday.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** There is an expression which I cannot repeat here but, to paraphrase, it means that when you advance an argument you should stand by it.

That was the minister's first position. There was the case of an admiral of the fleet who was condemned and denigrated by the minister. Six months later the minister said: "I really did not mean it". I wish he had developed the same epidermis with regard to the comment made by the member for Edmonton-Strathcona. But no, the minister was going to sue. He had no case because only what was said in the house was repeated outside it. I wonder when legal action will be taken? Never since General Currie in the Port Hope trial has there been anything like the reaction of Hellyer versus Nugent. I know him as Terry. When is the minister going to start the action? He must start it within a certain