

Morality in Government

glad there are times for humour. The resolution is as follows:

This house strongly deplores and condemns this government's actions in having the R.C.M. Police provide information to the government as to the past conduct of all members of parliament—

What about you Liberal members? Have you got nothing in the closet? Watch out, because the Prime Minister asked that you all be looked into. He was not so sure of you either. I repeat the resolution:

This house strongly deplores and condemns this government's actions in having the R.C.M. Police provide information to the government as to the past conduct of all members of parliament generally, a course of action which would destroy the independence of all members and undermine the institution of parliament.

The Prime Minister ridicules that. I say no more about the resolution. We have established the facts. They tried to silence us. They tried to prevent me saying what is known across this country. I do not want to quote editorials but there are many. Here is one headed "Political Malice", and another, "A New Pearson". Men and women in Canada cannot understand it. In correspondence to me they say: This is not in keeping with the man we thought we had; we did not agree with his views, but that he would fall for this kind of thing, no matter whether activated by the President of the Privy Council or the Minister of Justice or any of the others, makes a sad day for parliament.

The Liberals have not come out yet with the argument that members have to be careful how they vote on this motion lest they defeat the government. Well, one of the great authorities in this country is Dr. Eugene Forsey—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Prime Minister smiles about that but Dr. Forsey is an authority on national and international affairs. This is what he says:

A fresh election now, on the old distribution of seats, would be the ultimate outrage. Until redistribution can come into effect, a few months hence, some means must be found to carry on—

Then he goes on to say:

Mr. Pearson could follow the example of Mr. Disraeli in 1868. Disraeli's government was defeated April 30, 1868, by a vote of 330-265, On May 4, Disraeli told the house that he had obtained the Queen's consent to a dissolution "as soon as the public interests will permit,"—

The government went ahead and carried on for several months. It got the necessary legislation passed and, indeed, dissolution did not take place until November 11.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

• (5:40 p.m.)

Second, the government cannot rush into an election. The Prime Minister asked for the votes of the people of Canada so that he could get a majority and he did not get a majority. I prefer the objectiveness of Dr. Forsey to the uncertainty of the Minister of Transport.

The Liberals could simply resign (if they asked for an immediate dissolution, the Governor General would be bound to refuse, because of the redistribution situation). The Governor General would then send for . . .

The Leader of the Opposition

. . . and ask him to form a government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They wanted a majority and what did they end up with? A minority. I am just quoting from an authority and they do not like authorities. They do not like the truth given by the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police any more than they like the objectivity of Dr. Forsey.

Then he goes on to say that if the Governor General were to take it that we could not form a government, even a caretaker government, he could call an all-party conference to consider letting someone form a coalition caretaker government from the various representatives in this house, who in a community of endeavour would have to carry on similarly to what was done in Australia and New Zealand. I point this out because that is all they have left.

What we have before us, Mr. Speaker, is an explanation from the Prime Minister which is not in accordance with the facts. This is the last chance for parliament. Are we to be puppets in the hands of a Prime Minister who keeps dossiers on members? I do not know who these members are but he has dossiers on two or three of them. Watch out. Some day they will be produced. That is the position today. That is the position in respect of which the Canadian people have the right to be disturbed and which should receive the condemnation of hon. members whatever their party in this House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister rise to ask a question?

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask the right hon. gentleman whether I might now ask the question I wished to put earlier. In view of the reference the hon. gentleman made to McCarthyism, would the hon. gentleman now make a public apology to the hon.