

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 19, 1959

The house met at 11 a.m.

## PRIVILEGE

MR. MARTIN (ESSEX EAST)—REFERENCE TO  
REMARKS IN DEBATE ON JUNE 17

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I notice that during my absence while welcoming the Queen yesterday the hon. member for Essex East rose on a question of privilege and made certain allegations and statements. Your Honour was kind enough to suggest that in my absence, and because I was involved in the point of privilege, I should have an opportunity to comment on it, and recommended that the matter be left there.

Before I make any comment at all on the statements made yesterday by the hon. member for Essex East, may I read the pertinent portions of the remarks referred to by him which appear at page 4827 of *Hansard* of June 17, where I am reported as having said:

Here we have but a piece of paper containing a motion—

I was referring to the motion in question that was before the house. I continue:

—ingeniously contrived in order to sow suspicion. The hon. gentleman moving the motion will not take his stand behind the truth of the allegations and the alleged wrongdoing of the hon. member for Peel.

I emphasize those words “the alleged wrongdoing of the hon. member for Peel”. I continue:

I say this. I hope I shall never allow any hon. member to be struck in his honour and integrity by a motion such as this, a motion of suspicion fortified only by questions, with the mover holding the high and responsible position of Leader of the Opposition refusing to accept his personal responsibility to make a charge on the basis of his opinion and belief with respect to the alleged findings of wrongdoing by a judge.

What I said was, “The findings of the judge were alleged to be allegations of wrongdoing”, and that was made very clear earlier in my remarks, which cannot be taken out of context.

From time to time this matter comes up, and I am not going to deal with the cases which have been before the house on previous occasions, which arise from the fact that changes are made in order to make good sense without changing the purport. The hon. gentleman says that what was said was:

—with respect to the alleged findings of a judge in that direction.

Well, grammatically that does not make sense. “In that direction” refers, of course, to the alleged wrongdoing of the hon. member for Peel. May I say this. There has not been and was not any material change either in sense or in meaning. I want to make that most clear. The words “in that direction” are grammatically unclear. What I recall saying, but I am not going to argue it, is “in that connection”. I stated then, and I now state, that the opposition endeavoured to distort the findings of the judge in order to allege wrongdoing on the part of the hon. gentleman.

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Pearson:** Stick to the point.

**Mr. Speaker:** I suggest to the Prime Minister that in dealing with the alteration of *Hansard* it would not be proper to refer to the debate.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** All right, Mr. Speaker, but I have to make very clear the fact that there was no change in sense or in meaning, and I make that very clear now. I have no objection whatever, none whatever, although grammatically it is bad, to the restoration of any words suggested by the hon. member for Essex East. This question has been up on many occasions before. I remember prime minister St. Laurent on one occasion, in the course of a question asked relative to the Canadian forces not remaining in Berlin, saying in the house, “They were kicked out”.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Another diversion.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** And the next day *Hansard* showed it as “They were left out”. That was a change that is not in keeping with the traditions of the house.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** The usual chivalry.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I have seen my hon. friends opposite day after day reading their blues and making alterations. I think it is well that this is brought up because I think the house might pretty well decide—I know I am going to make a very careful examination from now on of all the changes day by day as I see the rereading taking place in this house—that changes are not to be made. I think this is just another example of what I believe should become the rule of the house and adhered to by all, that there should be no changes whatever, grammatical or otherwise, in order to bring out the sense.

I simply state that there is no change whatsoever in meaning or in reference to