

National Defence Act Amendment

promise to Defence Minister Paul Hellyer by repeating outside the Commons, an accusation that the defence minister used the "big lie" system developed by Adolf Hitler.

The next paragraph reads as follows:

Wednesday, Mr. Nugent took up the challenge—twice. Early in the day he repeated it to Winnipeg broadcasters, making it clear that he was reading from *Hansard*, the official record of the Commons.

Further down it reads:

He (Mr. Hellyer) has opened his mouth and put his big foot in it again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deachman: I gather from the applause of hon. members opposite that they concur in the use of this kind of language by an hon. member and they believe this is the way in which members of the house should behave both in and out of it. I say, shame on them. I continue to read from the same article:

Mr. Nugent said he meant every word when he said Mr. Hellyer was using "big lie" tactics. He said proof of the technique is in *Hansard*. "The biggest lie is more defence for more money"—

Farther along the article reads as follows:

Mr. Nugent said the defence minister says those opposed to unification are against progress. This is a "big lie".

He also said Mr. Hellyer's report that admirals were trying to run the department was "a big lie"—

Farther down it reads:

Can you wonder why I refer to the term of "big lie"? He received a standing ovation from the 150 party supporters—

They were Tories.

—when he pledged that if he has his way, unification will be achieved only "over my dead body."

On the front page of the *Winnipeg Tribune* of April 13 the following appeared:

During his 30-minute speech he employed the contentious phrase "the big lie" seven other times. In addition he called Mr. Hellyer a "blockhead".

All this may appear very humorous to hon. members opposite. Perhaps it is their belief that this is parliamentary language and that this is the way in which hon. members in the House of Commons and out of it should conduct themselves toward each other. I say this is unparliamentary language. It is a violation of the long-standing customs of this house. It is a violation of the customs of the British house and of parliaments everywhere. It is not the kind of language which hon. gentlemen everywhere who respect themselves, their persons or their parties should use. It is despicable language, it is dirty language and it is language for which the hon. member

[Mr. Deachman.]

should apologize. We are here to reason together.

Mr. Nugent: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Deachman: We cannot conduct our business by such language. I say that the language which the hon. gentleman has been using is unparliamentary and out of order both when the hon. member uses it in the house and elsewhere. It is filthy language which should be retracted.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to reply to the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a point of order Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: I understand the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is speaking on a point of order. When he has concluded his remarks I will hear the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. Nugent: The intemperate language used by the hon. member when he told me that my language is intemperate should be answer enough. The manner, conduct and behaviour of the hon. member in the house are usually such that he is the last person on that side from whom we should expect such language. I know that several of my friends wish to bring the behaviour of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra to the attention of the committee but I do not think anything can be gained from it. Certainly the hon. member is one week late. I used the phrase "the big lie technique" exactly a week ago today. Of course it would take him that long to wake up and act on instructions from the minister.

The particular falsehood which annoys me the most in this big lie technique is the one which perpetrates the idea that those who are opposed to unification are opposed to progress. This was the sum and substance of the argument advanced last week by the hon. member for Leeds. I thought that rather than bandy these words about today it would be more worth while to give a solid illustration of how far away these arguments are from the truth. It may be that hon. members have not heard or read the evidence of the witnesses. It may be they are unintentionally slandering the officers to whom this country owes so much for their long period of service.