

of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), who asked a question, by saying, "What is your God damned question anyway?" That is recorded in *Hansard*, unchanged and unexpurgated. I had expected that we were past the situation in which opposition members were treated in that way.

Some hon. Members: Order, order!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The matter before you is one that concerns the integrity of parliament and the House of Commons. It is one that cannot be justified. I had hoped the Prime Minister would have followed the course he did six years ago when one morning he made a statement that there was no foundation at all for a question I asked concerning a letter, and that afternoon he rose and apologized and said he wished he had taken the admonition of the right hon. member for Prince Albert before denying the existence of the letter. He apologized to the House of Commons and to me. Has he forgotten that?

That would indicate exactly the point I am making. The Prime Minister, by tilting his head just now, has indicated that he has forgotten that, and that is the point I make. He has forgotten so many of the things that constitute parliament and for which parliament stands, and I am not at all surprised that he has forgotten the incident in question.

Parliament demands, on the part of all of us, the assurance that when a statement is made as a fact, it shall be true, unchangeable, and the consequences to follow that statement are the basis of all parliamentary argument. That is the essence of parliament. We do not hold the views of Machiavelli. He did not understand our system because, after all, the British parliamentary system was just being built in those days. He said:

And a prince will never lack good excuses to colour his bad faith. One could give innumerable modern instances of this, showing how many pacts and promises have been made null and void by the bad faith of princes: those who have known best how to imitate the fox have come off best. But one must know how to colour one's actions and to be a great liar and deceiver. Men are so simple, and so much creatures of circumstance, that the deceiver will always find someone ready to be deceived.

That is not the parliamentary system. That is the idea of a dictatorship in which the dictator speaks. Throughout the years I have formed an admiration for the Prime Minister in many respects but I have never included veracity. I have had an admiration for his adroitness and his parliamentary—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I would like some of those whom the Prime Minister calls non-entities to let us know who they are so they will appear in *Hansard*.

An hon. Member: Stand up, Joe.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I am one of them.

An hon. Member: That's the first one.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I should like to repeat what I said, for the benefit of the right hon. gentleman. I said, and I quote, "I can take a joke", and that is the end of the quotation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Privilege—Mr. Diefenbaker

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman proves the truth of his own statement whenever he speaks.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): This is a real farce.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I have restricted my statements in regard to the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) because of the high esteem in which I have always held him.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Thank you.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Returning once again to the circumstances under which these statements were made by the Prime Minister, let me say they were made with utter disregard for the rights of parliament. That speech was intended to be delivered so that no one could answer it. When it was suggested that the opposition should speak first, the Leader of the Opposition, with his characteristic desire to live true to the parliamentary forum, took the stand, which was represented by a member of the opposition who discussed the matter with the House leader, that the Prime Minister should have the first opportunity.

I am not going over the facts, as I dealt with those at length on May 22. I do not know who misled the Prime Minister, but when I have regard for the facts, he seemed so anxious not to have Mr. Pitfield called before the committee or give evidence that I can only conclude that those two men sat down together and asked, "What can we say? What stories can we tell? How can we fill the hour and a half in order to prevent the opposition from speaking?" Under no circumstances would I have Mr. Pitfield give evidence concerning his position as Clerk of the Privy Council.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: For once we are in agreement. What I do object to is that this person is almost in the position of a Damon and Pythias relationship with the Prime Minister. His own staff did not produce this conglomeration of half-truths; it required somebody other than his staff to have brought forth this monstrosity.

● (1520)

I have already dealt with these various items. I shall not repeat what I said. To me they represent an endeavour to destroy a member of this House in respect of his credibility by spreading around, through the mouth of the Prime Minister, allegations that are not true. That is not parliament. The example of that is in the Profumo case. Profumo told parliament he had never been involved with the woman in question. That was not true. It was not because of his extramural activities that he was removed from office. I would have thought the Prime Minister would have kept in mind the case of Profumo and would have realized that to make statements that have no basis or inference in fact constitutes a degradation of the House of Commons and therefore represent a breach of privilege.

There are many works on this subject. Your Honour has them and I shall not quote the various items. I would