

National Defence Act Amendment

3 and indicated that the Speaker had made a decision at that time on the matter. I would draw the attention of the hon. member, and also the minister if he will listen for a moment, to the fact that we had no way in which to support the argument put forward by members on this side of this house on March 3 because the evidence which supported our argument was not available at that time. It was quite some time later that the evidence of the defence committee was found to substantiate the claims that we on this side of the house were making.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra suggests that, the Speaker having made a decision on the matter, we should forget it. This is not the first time, that a question of privilege has been raised in this house with respect to the hon. member's actions in committees. The evidence is now available, and despite what he or anybody else says about forgetting the matter the fact remains that *Hansard* for March 3 and also the evidence given before the defence committee on March 3 indicate that the hon. member did lie to this house.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak further to the question of privilege, I think that somewhere along the line credibility has to be considered. I remind the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, through your good offices, Mr. Chairman, that not only are hon. members opposite filibustering this afternoon but as reported at page 14613 of *Hansard* for April 6, half way down the left hand column of that page, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, speaking to a motion for papers during private members' hour, said:

Mr. Speaker, just before I rose to speak I was listening to the words of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) and I noticed something very peculiar in the chamber. Finally it became apparent to me, after looking around, that the trouble was that we were not graced with the presence of a single Tory.

The Chairman: Order. Surely what the hon. member is saying now is a little removed from the point of order that has been raised. The question before the committee is—

Mr. Forrestall: I was speaking to the question of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: The question before the committee is whether or not the language used by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is or is not parliamentary. That is the question that the Chair has to decide. If

hon. members have completed their remarks the Chair is now prepared to make a ruling.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: If hon. members wish to continue I shall hear the hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking to the point of order but am rising on the question of privilege. I thought we were speaking to a question of privilege. I thought Your Honour was going to deal with the question of privilege which was raised by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra subsequent to the point of order. I am talking about credibility. This is a matter of privilege, and if it becomes a matter of my raising it that is indeed what I will do.

I quoted the comments of the hon. member during private members' hour. As reported at page 14636 of *Hansard* for the same day, the right hand column near the bottom of the page, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra said:

I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. At one stage of the committee procedure—

He is there referring to the earlier session of the committee during the afternoon.

—we could not find a Tory in the whole house, so I do not think there is anything wrong with a member of the cabinet discharging his duty outside the house.

My question of privilege is that the hon. member is now rising on a point of order having himself been guilty less than ten days ago of exactly the same indiscretion.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra was instructed to become as excited as he did, but if he had bothered to listen to what I said yesterday he would have heard my explanation as to what is meant by the technique of the big lie. As reported at page 15022 of *Hansard* I illustrated the context in which I used that phrase in this house. I said:

To begin with, to understand what I mean by the technique of the big lie, it is not necessary for someone to tell a direct lie. In fact some of the most skilful methods employed in the technique of the big lie do not use a lie at all, although certainly they use half truths. The whole idea of the technique of the big lie is to make sure the facts are hidden, or at least to make sure that if the facts are revealed they are either confused or swamped under false arguments.

The hon. member's point of order is that this is unparliamentary language. I have not