## The Address-Mr. Diefenbaker

self-defence but in the interests of the country, to read this motion before we pass it, perhaps on the understanding that we could revert to it later in the afternoon in order to get the business done.

• (1420)

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, may I apologize. I thought that arrangements had been made to have the orders distributed. They are exactly the same as on the previous occasion, and I have no hesitation in giving the usual assurance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. At the moment I have a motion which is properly before us. If we are going to deal with it now, I must read the entire motion or have the mover read it.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, you can dispense, or let the matter stand. We have no objection to proceeding with it a little later this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: It is proposed that the matter stand over until later this day. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Let us fix the time at six o'clock.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there will be any doubt about the second motion which I shall now move.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A)—REFERENCE TO STANDING

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of Privy Council) moved:

That supplementary estimates (A) tabled this day be referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We will resume the business that was interrupted by the order made earlier.

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Louis Duclos for an address to His Excellency the Administrator of the Government of Canada, the amendment thereto of Mr. Stanfield (p. 42) and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Broadbent (p. 53).

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, at the time of the adjournment, which now seems like a millennium ago, I was dealing with the situation on Parliament Hill. I had mentioned that I felt, disagreeing to the utmost with resorting to violence, that the government must assume considerable responsibility for the manner in which, from the time this group left Vancouver, the government continued to vacillate and did not take action. I

[Mr. Stanfield]

mentioned the RCMP and rather questioned the use of that body for the kind of action it was engaged in here on Parliament Hill. Indeed, when I was prime minister I refused to permit the RCMP to be used for strike breaking in Newfoundland because I felt that that body should not be used in any way, directly or indirectly, which was inconsistent with its tradition.

Now, sir, I intend to say a word or two regarding parliament, and in particular some of the changes that have taken place in the last few months. I mentioned that there had been changes. As one looks at the government front bench, one cannot but be impressed by the fact that today you are a minister and, with your government still in office, tomorrow you are not. It is a case of in again and out again. The only one who ever found a way to get back again was the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey).

I think of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Haidasz) who brought many votes to the Liberal Party in the election. I remember him being spoken of by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in words of adulation and eulogy which could only lead one to believe that he was a minister who was certainly in the best graces of the Prime Minister. But out he went. Then there is the hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury). He, too, was in that delightful position. He was a minister of national revenue who had performed in a way that met the praise of the Prime Minister and other ministers. He is gone.

Then you think of one or two others who disappeared, and one can only think of the Biblical words, "greater love hath no man than this"—that he lay down the portfolios of his friends for his own survival.

## Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is the strangest thing I have ever known. If I were to use the language that might be used by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) in reference to the chickens of two years ago, I would say "the slaughter of the innocents". It is all because for some reason the Prime Minister decided they must go. However, there is another minister who apparently saved himself by his tears, and I know he will identify himself immediately.

I congratulate the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) on his victory in his constituency. I will always defend my brother members in my own province, so I was deeply concerned by the reply given to Douglas Fisher by the Minister of Agriculture when asked how things were going. Mr. Fisher said that when he asked the minister about his party's prospects, he was his usual candid self and said, "If the Prime Minister would send Otto Lang off to China on a mission, things would be better". The interesting thing is that he did not go, Mr. Speaker, and I saw the two of them sitting together, placed there no doubt by the Prime Minister because of this little interlude. I can only conclude that great are the uses of victory because there they sit, cheek by jowl.

I am concerned about the way in which the Minister of Justice, in giving some legal opinions on what should be done, is not only being overawed but overruled by the Prime Minister. He will recall various incidents, but I remember the one on June 24 when the FLQ kidnappers of Mr. Cross were found in Paris. The Minister of Justice said that he did not see any difficulty in extraditing them.