

*Privilege*

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House when this matter arose originally. I came in when the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) was speaking and, of course, I listened with interest to what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had to say.

I have been here a long time, Mr. Speaker, but I have never heard a more hypocritical statement made by anyone than when the Prime Minister this afternoon wrapped himself in the garments of purity and spoke as though it were the Sermon on the Mount that this House was to receive.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Do I hear an interruption?

**Mr. Trudeau:** No, no.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I would be very glad to have assistance at any time when I say this—the whole situation goes back several weeks. No one has caused the government more worry and concern than the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Cossitt). He has revealed things that have caused them difficulties, so he must be obliterated, it seems. That was apparent today in the speech of the Prime Minister. To think that any member of parliament dared speak out against this government impressed him as dangerous to the safety of the state. I said it was hypocritical—it is Machiavellian as well.

His whole attitude this afternoon—and I admire a good debate and he explained himself and revealed himself with unusual clarity—was “we must get rid of the hon. member for Leeds because he dares to speak out.” Only in the last few days the Prime Minister was reported as having said, “I never speak to him”. I heard him say it. If the Prime Minister were to stand up when he interrupts I would be only too glad. The Prime Minister said that he would have nothing to do with the hon. member for Leeds. He said, “I just do not acknowledge his presence.”

Today was the culmination of events. What a wonderful opportunity for the government to get rid of this person who has proved to them that he does things they do not like. The Prime Minister spoke of patriotism in quivering terms. I could deal with that, going back to the days of war.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The right hon. gentleman has full appreciation of what I have in mind. He speaks of the terrible risk to security in this document. I do not know what it contains. Does the Prime Minister know? He does. That convinces me it must be very bad. After all, in the last couple of weeks when revelations were made concerning the operations of the USSR in Ottawa the Prime Minister said, “I did not pay much attention to that—after all, we all spy.”

Above everything else in this House a measure of respect must be shown, whether by the government or by the opposition, without which this House would not operate.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

I go further and say that, in my opinion, under the law a search cannot be made of the office of a member of parliament in this House of Commons without the permission of parliament.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** You cannot do that. It has never been done. It cannot be done without the permission of this House. Are members of parliament going to vote to permit an act of that kind? I remember well when a member of this House, Mr. Rose, was ultimately charged with a variety of treason. He had all the rights of parliament. Mackenzie King was the Prime Minister and he insisted that parliament, above everything else, was important in the preservation of the rights of individuals represented here.

• (1632)

What is behind all this? The government is afraid of the hon. member for Leeds. It is frightened of the revelations he can make. It decides to intimidate him, and every other member of this House, by a pretence that a search can be made. All that is asked for is a reasonable course of action—“Give me an opportunity. Monday I will be available and whatever orders have been determined I shall submit to.”

The Prime Minister admitted a moment ago that he knows the contents of this document. Well, if he does, why the rush? He knows what the document is. It cannot be hidden between now and Monday because he knows what is in it. I did not expect that admission from him. But that clarifies the situation for me that what is happening here, Mr. Speaker, is something similar to what happened in the United Kingdom in the 1630's to 1640's when members were intimidated. He knows what the contents are. There is going to be no revelation by this search. If the member for Leeds were to hide it, the Prime Minister could produce the copy he has because he knows the particular document.

Surely it becomes more apparent than ever that what he has in mind is vindictive in every sense of the word. How dare anybody criticize him in any way or do anything that might be revealing of something he does not want seen or heard. That is the position. It is as simple as that. I suggest to the Prime Minister, while he made a very valuable and very effective speech, because I always admire that type of debating, that he give his conscience an opportunity at this moment and say, “I will give him four days. I am not going to suffer, the Government of Canada is not going to suffer, and security is not going to suffer.” On the other hand, if he does not agree to that, what he is endeavouring to do is close the mouths of the members of the House of Commons because criticism has become quite general of this government today.

I remember the days when I was Prime Minister and we had a deficit of \$750,000, how they howled over there. This year it is \$10,000 million. They want to cover up, they want to conceal, they want to delude. Mr. Speaker, if you permit the Prime Minister and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) to dictate to this House of Commons the right of search without