

National Defence Act Amendment

● (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Deachman: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, at the moment there is a point of order before the house regarding the use of parliamentary language both in and out of the house. I believe the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is neither objecting to nor discussing the point of order. The hon. member is reverting to his speech and is again using the very words to which I called the attention of the Chair. With respect, sir, I should like a ruling with regard to the use of such language against other hon. members in this chamber.

The Chairman: Has the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona completed his remarks on the point of order?

Mr. Nugent: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The hon. member has raised a question with regard to the use of words in this chamber. I say to the hon. member that when members on this side are asked to withdraw true statements because of the rules, then it is time the rules were changed. In so far as the word "lie" is concerned, that word was banded around by the Minister of National Defence the other evening as can be ascertained from checking *Hansard*. He accused members on this side of the house of repeating lies. I see no difference between what the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is doing now and what the Minister of National Defence did last Monday evening. I would draw the attention of the Chair also to the fact that the hon. member who is now raising this point of order based on the rules did not use the technique of the big lie but used the big lie itself. I say to the hon. member who raised the question that he deliberately lied to this house on March 3, and I refer to page 13702 of *Hansard*.

The Chairman: Order, please. I must say to the hon. member for Cape Breton South that he surely does not want, even on a point of order, to accuse another hon. member of deliberately lying. This would be completely unparliamentary language.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): The hon. member raised this question and I intend to prove the statement fully by reference to *Hansard* for March 3, page 13702, and the

March 3 proceedings of the defence committee, page 1960. The hon. member who is now making reference to lies is the very person who came into this house and reported that something had happened in the defence committee which never did happen.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege—

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Your question of privilege was raised.

The Chairman: Order, please. The Chair is already listening to a point of order raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton South. If the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has a question of privilege, I will hear him next.

Mr. Deachman: I have two points of privilege in respect of this matter.

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I should like to call the attention of the committee to the question of privilege raised on March 3 when members on this side stood up and denied that there had been a show of hands called for in the committee on that particular occasion.

The Chairman: Order, please. I recognize the point the hon. member is attempting to make. The question before the Chair is one concerning unparliamentary language and I suggest to the hon. member for Cape Breton South, as well as to other hon. members, that if this point of order is to be placed before the Chair we should discuss the question of unparliamentary language.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): To that I can only say that the matter should have been raised by someone in whom we could believe. The hon. member has raised a point of order based on the fact that the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona said that the Minister of National Defence was using the big lie technique. I only wanted to bring to the attention of the house that the Minister of National Defence used the same word. This hon. member is the last man who should stand up and point a finger at anybody. The proof of that statement is in the record of this house. I repeat that if any member of this house has to withdraw a true statement because of the rules, then it is time the rules were changed.

I point out too that the Minister of National Defence used the same word. He can get up