

National Defence Act Amendment

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, on the question of privilege may I say that the question is not as to the hon. members' motives. The words suggested either that he introduced it and knew it was phony or did this not knowing any better. I think it is entirely plausible from what we know of the hon. member that he introduced it out of sheer stupidity with no motives at all.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Well, of course—

An hon. Member: An arrogant bunch.

Mr. Churchill: Yes, they certainly are arrogant. I have asked the Secretary of State to withdraw her accusation and I have also asked the Chairman on a question of privilege that it be withdrawn. If you, sir, do not wish to rule that this is a valid question of privilege then I must, under the circumstances, accept your silence. I have asked the Secretary of State to withdraw her remark and she will not do it. She knows she cannot prove that the letter was phony. She was afraid after making that statement and every member of the Liberal party is afraid. They are afraid of that issue.

On the second point which she raised with regard to the coat of arms—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Can the hon. member prove that the letter was genuine?

Mr. Nesbitt: What letter?

Mr. Churchill: Under what circumstances do I have to bring proof in this house with regard to what is introduced in this house? Will the hon. member prove to us that the things he introduces are genuine? I have grave doubts about that, but I have never bothered to attempt to insult the hon. member by asking him to prove his innocence. I doubt that he would be able to do so, but I am not making that suggestion.

The hon. lady has suggested, in respect of the references to the alleged coat of arms appearing on the medallion for our school children, that there is something wrong with that and that we were the ones who introduced it. This morning I happened to read the brochure published by the present government in 1964 describing the coat of arms. The Secretary of State, of course, has not read this document. She does not get around to some of these things. But in this document there is a definition of the coat of arms. It is defined as

consisting of a shield, a helmet with a mantling and supporting arms on either side and the inscription below. The coat of arms consists of the whole picture, not solely the shield. So once again the Secretary of State is wrong. Perhaps she now would like to leave the house and continue her correspondence elsewhere, because her contribution to this debate is of the same low quality as that of the Minister of Transport. It has added nothing. I should like to return to where I started at clause 5.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: If there should be any other diversionary remarks I will be prepared to receive them and deal with them appropriately. This clause wipes out the famous names, "Royal Canadian Navy", "Canadian Army", and "Royal Canadian Air Force". They now become a part of our past which according to the Liberal party should be forgotten. This is what I object to—forgetting the past.

An hon. Member: You never learn from the past.

Mr. Churchill: I wish the Liberal party would learn from the past. They received a very severe lessons in 1956, 1957 and 1958. I hope the Canadian public will give them the same severe lesson again in the near future.

An hon. Member: It is coming.

Mr. Churchill: They are attempting to destroy our traditions. The other night I read into the record from the writings of Terence Robertson certain words concerning the change in our national defence policy. He showed very clearly what is in the minds of the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence, namely Canadianize everything in this country. If anything has a hint of origin other than in Canada it is to be obliterated.

The article by Terence Robertson and the speech I made in respect of it the other night have not been answered. Who on that side of the house is going to answer that speech and the remarks of Terence Robertson? Silence prevails. Of course, that address was made at 9.30 at night. When one speaks at 9.30 at night in this house the things he says do not get into the press and rarely reach radio or television. Therefore, his words go unnoticed.

An hon. Member: It all depends who says it.