

National Defence Act Amendment

now and deny it if he wishes but in his last speech he said that members of the opposition were repeating lies. Why did the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra not raise a point of order at that time? Why did he not refer to the rule book when he came into the house on March 3 and lied to the house? This is a true statement and can be substantiated by reference to *Hansard* and the evidence of the defence committee. It is a true statement and one that no rule can make any member back up from. If we have to back up from the truth, then it is time the rules were changed. It is certainly time the rules were applied to an hon. member who gets away with lying in this house.

Mr. Deachman: On the point to which the hon. member for Cape Breton South has just referred, I may say that this matter of privilege was brought before the house and dealt with by a ruling of Mr. Speaker. What the hon. member is doing now is reflecting on a ruling of the Chair which tossed out that particular case. There is no case of any kind here because the matter was dealt with by the Chair. In this house one does not reflect upon the rulings of Mr. Speaker. This is clear.

Might I say further, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman is still addressing himself to the very point of order I am raising, the use of the word "lie" in this chamber as has been done by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, supported by the hon. member for Cape Breton South who has used the same word. Incidentally, this is nothing less than a revolt against the rules of decency which govern this chamber, a revolt by hon. members opposite against the rules of decency which govern debates in this parliament.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, in spite of all the desk slapping that has been going on on the Liberal side I should like to deal strictly with the words which have been used in this debate. I should like to refer you, sir, to page 14786 of *Hansard* for April 11. I am quite sure the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra was in the house at the time this statement was made but I did not hear him raise a point of order with regard to unparliamentary language. May I quote to you exactly what was said and by whom it was said so you may take these facts into consideration in case you feel there should be some condemnation of the use of these words. The pertinent part reads as follows:

Mr. Hellyer: And yet the Leader of the Opposition repeats the lie—

Mr. Diefenbaker: You should never talk about lies.

[Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South).]

Mr. Hellyer: —as his followers have on numerous occasions during the course of this debate.

I say to you, sir, that it would have been rather nice if some Liberal had stood up and condemned the Minister of National Defence for this effrontery. No point of order or question of privilege was raised at that time. It seems to me that what is fair for one side certainly ought to be for the other side. In so far as the point of order is concerned, the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is in the course of developing an argument. It is an argument which has been made before within and outside this house. I feel that the house is entitled to hear precisely what he has to say. He is bringing forward something which many members have stressed during this debate. It is a point which I feel is well taken. Certainly the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is quite capable of taking responsibility, either within the house or outside it, for anything which he cares to say.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Chairman, it is clear that in the course of any debate over any length of time things will be said which will be regretted by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the house. That is something that tends to happen.

Mr. Nugent: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Matheson: When I rise I usually try to prepare myself and to conduct myself when on my feet as a gentleman. I try very hard to do that. It is not very easy because my instincts are not always gentlemanly. However, may I say this. When a matter is raised as a point of order, as it has been, it is incumbent on the Chair, with respect, to make an adjudication. It is clear that in the course of this debate no challenge has been made to such remarks. I think the point has now come when we must make such a challenge and from now on guard ourselves against untimely, improvident and ill-considered remarks, which are clearly out of character with the traditions of this chamber. I suggest it serves no useful purpose to review every development of the past days or weeks. What we are concerned with here is the matter which was raised a few moments ago. I think we are entitled to a ruling from Your Honour on this point for guidance in future debate.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, I rise on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. The hon. member referred to a question of privilege which was raised on March