

Morality in Government

of non-confidence in the government at the first opportunity in the coming parliament.

The article goes on:

Charged Mr. Diefenbaker with "complete contempt of Parliament" for not convening Parliament as soon as possible after the election and with a crucial Commonwealth conference facing the leader of a minority government.

I should like to pause, Mr. Speaker, to remind hon. members of what took place in Canada last fall with regard to the calling of parliament. Another charge was:

Claimed that Mr. Diefenbaker's plea for a cooling off period following the election had resulted in "wasted weeks" after "wasted years".

He went on generally to outline the charges that became all too well known during the 1962 election. This was an election in which any tactics were used such as "Diefenbucks" and all the other gimmicks of propaganda in order to do precisely what is indicated in that headline—"Won't Ease All-Out Attack Until P.C.s Fall". That attack, of course, continued in the House of Commons.

I go now to the words of Mr. Claude Ryan to bring these remarks to a conclusion. Mr. Ryan always has been a responsible editorial writer. In the light of what has been taking place in this house, when the Munsinger affair was launched on parliament and on the people Mr. Ryan had this to say, as found in a newspaper report on editorials written by him, the report being headed, "Pearson, Cardin Urged to Resign":

By his own hand he has destroyed the myth that he once created around his name. There is now nothing left for him to do but to draw the ineluctable conclusion.

Notwithstanding remarkable talents and his long experience in public affairs, Mr. Pearson has revealed himself to be inept to govern.

During the last few months he has taken several deplorable decisions over which he later must have chewed his fingernails. In less than two years he has burned out at least half a dozen collaborators of top standing.

On serious occasions he has displayed a staggering lack of courage and solidarity. Nobody can feel secure any more under his leadership.

That was Mr. Ryan's editorial comment. I can understand why the Prime Minister was so exercised by the remarks I made over the C.B.C. on December 11, 1964, but I do not think it is in the interest of preservation of our parliamentary system for the Queen's first minister to use tactics which, as has been described in the amendment, bring the R.C.M.P. into the role of political police in order to bring hon. members of this house into discredit.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

My own experience has been recited here this afternoon to indicate that the Munsinger affair is just one of a series of episodes which are largely responsible for so badly poisoning the atmosphere of parliament that we now are faced with a situation across the country where a good many people question the institution of parliament as being a proper method of ruling the country. I should have brought into the house this afternoon the letters I have from my constituents which consistently harp on the theme, what has gone wrong with parliament? This is the question I was endeavouring to answer as I spoke to the people of Canada in a radio broadcast on December 11, 1964. I will conclude my remarks by reading one paragraph:

• (6:00 p.m.)

There was a time, not so long ago, when Canada, secure in her internal serenity, a serenity based on a spirit of good will and tolerance, looked askance at the racism, rioting, and all the other indices of social and political confusion in other parts of the world. Now, it would appear the poisons are seeping through the Canadian body politic and we too have become a sick society.

It is for this reason that I heartily endorse the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Royal.

Mr. Knowles: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might ask the house, and in particular the Acting Prime Minister, if it would not meet the wishes of the house to agree to take a supper adjournment this day?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Starr: This is agreeable to us, Mr. Speaker, and for the course of this debate. May I therefore extend that suggestion to include tomorrow?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Does the house agree that during this debate, that is, for today and tomorrow, the period from six o'clock to eight o'clock shall be considered as the dinner recess?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Peters: Indefinitely.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is so ordered.

Mr. Kindt: Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?