

*Supply—Justice*

of most of the hon. gentleman's former friends in the province of Newfoundland. This is what it says:

Because of a feeling that John Diefenbaker was a towering figure in Canadian politics, we protested vigorously a few years ago the efforts of the Liberals to gerrymander him out of his seat in the House of Commons.

In 1956, we said here that he was the obvious choice to succeed George Drew as leader of the Conservative party.

In 1957 and 1958, we expressed the hope that he would lead the Conservatives to victory in Canada. We are not alone today in thinking that John Diefenbaker has failed to fulfil his earlier promise.

That thought has been growing in dimensions and expression during the past year. Yet nothing could more clearly reveal the inadequacies of Mr. Diefenbaker than his extraordinary contradiction of orders given by the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. in response to the request for reinforcements for central Newfoundland.

The consequence was revealed on Monday when a great career police officer, a man respected far beyond the borders of Canada for wisdom, ability and integrity, was compelled by the unaccountable intervention of the Prime Minister to resign his command.

Then there is a paragraph referring to the commissioner which is not strictly relevant. Although I should like to read it, I shall not do so out of consideration for the committee. The editorial continues:

In this intervention, Mr. Diefenbaker and his Minister of Justice did more than question the judgment and authority of Commissioner Nicholson. With complete disregard for the consequences, they denied necessary reinforcements for the tired men of the R.C.M.P. and Newfoundland constabulary in central Newfoundland, exposed them to danger, and compelled the provincial government to undermine the security of St. John's in order to send more provincial police to Grand Falls.

This was done without a proper inquiry into the situation in Newfoundland.

I think that is as far as I should read because the rest of it deals with questions that are not directly relevant. I want to end up my remarks by saying that it seems to me that the minister was grossly derelict in his duty and deserving of the censure of parliament for presuming to intervene in a matter that was entirely within provincial jurisdiction. Having waited until the last moment, having allowed the authorities in the province to have every reason to believe they could rely upon these reinforcements, whatever the contractual situation may have been, it was a very grave affront indeed to all the people of the province to take the action that was taken in this matter. I may say in concluding what I said on the budget, that I do not believe the people of this country will ever forget that this government in this crisis put themselves on the side of the lawbreaker rather than on the side of law and order.

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Chairman, a good deal of what the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate has said, he has said with more heat

than with light. I shall not attempt to answer him in kind. I shall just recite the facts because the facts give the answer to my hon. friend's exuberance as well as to all the baseless charges that he has laid. The facts, as a matter of fact, are so well known that I am surprised that the hon. gentleman would have thought that he could create in the minds of this committee—and no doubt he thought that if he could create it here, he could create it in the minds of others outside in the country—the impression that the facts are other than they are and the impression that there was something to be characterized by the words that he used such as “unwarranted invasions of provincial rights”, “deserving of the censure of the house” and so on in what he says that we have done. Let us look at the facts. I think it will be more effective if I analyse the facts calmly than if I attempt to generate the same amount of heat as that generated by the hon. gentleman.

First of all, he suggests that there is something inconsistent and something somehow shameful in the fact that on Wednesday, March 11, I made a statement in which I praised the conduct of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in maintaining law and order on the one hand whereas, on March 16, I explained my reasons for refusing to send additional Royal Canadian Mounted Police to the province of Newfoundland. There is nothing inconsistent between those two positions. Certainly the responsibility of the men who were in Newfoundland under contract was to remain there and carry out the lawful orders that they received. That they did to the best of their ability under, as I have said on numerous occasions, extremely difficult circumstances. I had and still have nothing but admiration for the way in which they discharged those obligations. But the sending of reinforcements is a very different situation or a very different thing altogether. It is a very different thing to say that men there under a contract with responsibilities must remain there and carry out that contract and discharge those responsibilities to the best of their ability, as they did—that is very different from the position raised when we received a request to send fifty extra reinforcements in to take care of a situation which had been created, as the Prime Minister said, in large part by the extraordinary actions of the premier of that province.

It was with respect to the new situation which would be created by the sending in of fifty further reinforcements that I was called upon to exercise my judgment and to make my decision, and I did it. I was not called upon to exercise any judgment or to make any decision with regard to the men who were