

harsh things are said. As long as they are we will not have a one-party state. As long as they are we will not have the dominance of a party in a minority that without regard to the traditions of parliament, tramples on the rights of parliament. Whatever numerical majority may now obtain and whatever the result may be of the count—and I am going to make a reference to the *Créditistes* a little later—this last week we have witnessed the ravishment, if not the rape, of parliament.

During my day, Mr. Speaker, regardless of my position in the house I never made motions to criticize anyone for what he said outside the house. I have always believed that in the course of parliamentary debate, and outside the house too, one right that must be maintained is the right of free speech. I could not countenance any action being taken by this House of Commons on account of words spoken outside the house, however much I disagreed with them. This is a principle that is embedded in our parliamentary life. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, any such motion could only have the effect of restoring a degree of certainty on the part of the government that they were still in charge and that parliament was still active.

I do not want to repeat any of the arguments that have been made except in a general way. I have been asked over and over again during the course of the last few days: Where do you stand on this question? I have never asked for sympathy on the part of anyone. I have always been prepared to take my stand through the years. One stand, I hope, will be remembered, and that is that however humble the individual, however great those that do tyranny, during my years in this house I have always spoken out against this kind of action, and I will continue to do so as long as I am here.

Parliament, Mr. Speaker, has been emasculated. No longer will it be necessary to ring the bells of parliament for an hour or an hour and a half. From now on we will be able to vote, no matter what comes up, as soon as debate is over. Because whatever the result and however important the subject matter, next day the government will be able to say: Well, we really were not voting confidence last night; we want a second chance.

A variety of arguments have been put forward. One hon. gentleman advanced the argument that there was not a large enough percentage of the house present when the vote took place. Well, Mr. Speaker, 71 per cent of the members were present. This government

*Motion Respecting House Vote*

was elected in 1965 with about 42 per cent of the vote. As a government they now ask for a rerun. When I lost an election I wished the next day that we could run it over again because the next day is the day when people meet you and say they are sorry you were defeated, that they were with you yesterday. Under a democratic system, however, we are not given the opportunity of a rerun, or we have not been in the past. This is a sad day for parliament, Mr. Speaker.

● (4:00 p.m.)

I intended to come to the house late in the afternoon, having been told that I should have this place on the speaking order. Then I heard that the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) was speaking and I came to hear him. I heard not the hon. member for Villeneuve but the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill).

In the years I have been in the house, in the days of war, I saw Liberal members taking the hon. member's stand. I deeply regret that he found it necessary to take the course of action that he did, but there is one thing that this house must admit. Another Churchill has done the same thing and he did it twice. Our Churchill served in the ranks during the first world war for three years and served with distinction in the last war. He won the D.S.O. for the utmost gallantry in the field.

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Sir, when great principles are at stake there is loyalty to one's party, but there is such a thing as loyalty to principles as one sees it. It came to me as a profound shock to see what is happening in this chamber. I will not mention by name those who decided that what was being done was not in their opinion for the good of the nation. What happened demonstrates what parliament is for. We are joined together in unity in our parties, but when a party loses its idealistic concepts it is time for others on the other side of the house to take a stand.

They are great parliamentarians, those hon. members sitting on the government side. I will not name any of them because that might be regarded as a designation.

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I must admit that the dean of the house comes within that classification. One of the greatest things that happened to him was what prevented his being here for the mess the other night. Fate often