

National Defence Act Amendment

us to continue the debate in the hope that the public would become aware of the issues involved and would bring pressure to bear on government supporters so that we might stop what I consider to be a very foolish move by the Minister of National Defence. In addition to having the right to continue the debate in the hope that we will persuade the public to bring pressure to bear on the government on this question, I believe it is perfectly proper, technical procedure to point out the kind of arguments used on the other side of the chamber and the fallacy of some of the points raised in the general tenor of the argument.

In this connection I referred to the lead editorial which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* of last Saturday and pointed out that, the editor ignored the facts and copied hon. members opposite in some of the arguments they have used in this debate. Many of the arguments they use have been repeated and repeated throughout the country and are repeated no matter how many times they are disproved by the evidence given before the committee. For instance, we heard the minister and his supporters suggest that the military wanted to control and run things instead of the government. The evidence given before the committee has made it perfectly clear that this argument is completely contrary to the facts, but that does not stop government supporters repeating it time after time.

We have heard the minister repeat from time to time that what the government is now trying to do by the unification bill was explained and spelled out in the white paper. The minister has said this despite the fact that every senior military adviser who was with him at that time said they had no such understanding and certainly it could not be taken from the white paper in any manner, shape or form.

● (4:00 p.m.)

One of the most important facts that the minister keeps distorting is the meaning of integration and unification. The argument put forward by the minister and his supporters is that integration and unification are a package deal, just one scheme, and that unification is necessary in order to complete the integration process. Of course that has been disproven by the evidence before the committee and even by the minister's own chief witness, the chief of the general staff, General Allard. I believe it is proper debating technique in the house to quote the evidence before the committee proving how wrong these arguments are. Of

course the purpose of doing this, if government supporters insist on using almost exclusively arguments which are obviously contrary to the facts, is to prove by the facts that the government has a very weak case. This is the situation today. If we take away all their fallacious arguments the government has nothing left on which to pin its support of unification.

I have often thought that the meanest and dirtiest argument used by government supporters is that those who are opposed to unification are opposed to progress. This has been echoed by various members in the house. In the *Ottawa Citizen* of last Saturday there was an article on the editorial page written by Charles King, the associate editor, which repeats what I would call a typical example of the technique of the big lie. I am sorry that my copy of that issue of the *Citizen* is missing because I would have liked to quote a paragraph or two from the article. However, I think I am being fair to Mr. King when I say that the purport of his article was that those who oppose unification—

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order which I will state very quickly. My point of order is that the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona has over the past few days, both in the House of Commons and out of it, repeatedly used the word "lie" in connection with another member of this house. I call the attention of the house to citation 145 on page 126 of Beauchesne, fourth edition, which reads as follows:

It has been formally ruled by Speakers in the Canadian Commons that a statement by an honourable member respecting himself and peculiarly within his own knowledge must be accepted, but it is not unparliamentary to temperately—

I wish to emphasize the word "temperately"

—criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible. B.352, 365. A statement made by a member in his place, is considered as made upon honour and cannot be questioned in the house or out of it.

I repeat the words "in the house or out of it". We know what has been said in the house over the past few days by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, and I will refer to a clipping from the *Winnipeg Free Press* of Thursday, April 13, which quotes what the hon. member has been saying outside the house and is therefore relevant to citation 145 which I just read.

It reads as follows:

Terry Nugent, Conservative member of parliament for Edmonton-Strathcona, Wednesday kept a