

*National Defence Act Amendment*

As the hon. member demonstrated in his speech, he had nothing to say about unification. I do not think he has read the evidence of the committee. I do not think he knows anything about it; but he undoubtedly knows how to make one of those typical Social Credit speeches which reveal to us the limitations which Social Crediters believe exist on democracy—that the majority have the right to vote and that is democracy. Certainly rule by majority is the cornerstone of democracy; but don't forget that majority only indicates the power, the balance of power, and that the right to rule by power is held by every other form of government. Any form of dictatorship, if you have the power, gives you the right to rule. It is the way we get the power that makes our way of ruling by power the better. But ruling because we have the power is not the crowning glory of democracy.

It is time that Social Crediters, especially in this house, who are fundamentally lacking in this knowledge, should understand that the crowning glory of democracy is respect for the rights of minorities and individuals. It is this which gives us the right of free speech. It is not the rule by majority that is so important to us. It is that protection which individuals and minorities enjoy under our system that they do not get under those other systems which rule by power, that makes democracy worth while; it is the right to use that freedom of speech to persuade. That is the basis of our democratic and parliamentary system of government, and that is the system we are using now.

There have been suggestions from the other side of the chamber, echoed by papers across the country, that now is the time to stop this debate, that now is the time to take the vote because all the evidence has been heard. I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that only a small fraction of the very valuable evidence before the committee has been brought before the house, that there are many good, sound arguments to be heard, and certainly no one can deny us the right to that last resort of every politician in this country who feels he is fighting for what he must fight for, the attempt to try to get the time to educate the public on this very complicated and important subject, and to ask the house to allow a time for public knowledge to spread so that public opinion can make itself felt.

I certainly realize the risks I run, Mr. Chairman, if, being one of those who has spoken, as my opponents would say, to an excessive length of time in the house, my

[Mr. Nugent.]

electors should feel I have been wasting the time of the house, and they come to the conclusion I was wrong. Certainly while it is human nature to allow someone to make a mistake, if you make a mistake and press vehemently on with it, and in that course of action continue to waste the time of the house and fight as hard as I intend to fight, then I presume the penalty one would pay would be extra severe. I am quite prepared to take that risk. Of course I am convinced in my own mind I am running very little risk, but they always say the person who is crazy is the last one to know it, and it could be that I am. However, I have studied the evidence and I do have tremendous respect for the witnesses who appeared. I am convinced in my own mind that, given an ample opportunity, the result of public opinion on this subject is going to vindicate my stand and the stand of my party. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear again that the points I am making are simply to illustrate the approach to this debate.

Last Tuesday, the last time I had a chance to get the floor, the minister took umbrage at my reference to the technique of the big lie, but there was something in an Ottawa paper, the *Ottawa Citizen* on Saturday, which is such a beautiful illustration of this technique that I must touch on it.

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.

I have time tonight to give only one illustration. In the *Ottawa Citizen* on Saturday there appeared an editorial, which I presume was written by Chris Young, headed "The Nugent Case—What's the Limit on Privilege." Anyone who read it would be led to believe that there is something wrong with the privileges of parliament, because I somehow was able to get protection outside the house and the minister was not able to get at me. This would be a distortion or false use of the rules.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, nothing could be farther from the truth in this case. The man who wrote that editorial knew very well I said outside the house exactly what I said