

Morality in Government

It seems a queer thing, an odd plan, perhaps a stupid plan. But it is obviously a plan that the government has gone into with deliberation and with the approval of the Prime Minister. As might be expected, much more than the Munzinger case will now be heard.

I read this article into the record, Mr. Speaker, because it bears out something that I feel we have been a little slow on this side to grasp, namely, the appearance of statements in 1962 read this afternoon to the effect that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson), now Prime Minister, in several places announced that under no circumstances would anything happen in the house until the government of the day was defeated. These headlines went all across Canada. This policy of destruction of government at any cost to parliament or the members of this house was started on that occasion. I cannot divulge any part of what I know for the simple reason that I have to hold myself to my oath as a privy councillor and to the level of ethics to which I personally adhere.

I want to ask the members of the Social Credit party now about a pledge they made to the people during the last election campaign to the effect they would support the government except on matters of corruption or doubtful action. This was the pledge which I am sure was made with all sincerity. I have fought the Social Credit party just as I have fought the Liberals and the N.D.P. On an issue such as this, I have a right to ask the Social Credit members where they stand. Will they come with us in a clearcut expression of opinion that no one, the monarch or the first spokesman of the monarch, has the right to apply police state principles to the members of this house.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I remind our friends in the Cr ditiste party that in the election in 1963 they had a man by the name of Dupuis flung at them. He had instructions to get the Cr ditistes. He was sent out to follow every member of the Cr ditiste party and overwhelm them with the thunder of his voice, and make charges against them. Is this not true? It is true. This man came into the house and was rewarded with a position in the cabinet by the present Prime Minister. Even after the government of the day knew of the allegations made against him by the Quebec government, that member stayed in the house and in the cabinet.

● (9:40 p.m.)

I think the Cr ditistes know that if they want the right as individual members of

[Mr. Hamilton.]

parliament or collectively as a party to survive, they have to expect that with Dupuis out of the way someone else will take his place. We hear rumours and rumbles of this tonight. I have to ask members of parliament, both individually and as members of a party, where they stand on this issue of using the police for a purpose for which they were never intended, namely, to threaten and to restrict the freedom of the individual members of the house.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, there may be many members of the Liberal party across this country who remember the principles of Liberalism, who remember the long struggles over hundreds of years to build up the freedom of individuals in this country and in our parliamentary structure. The many Liberals who have shared these principles with many others will remember that their loyalty to them is greater than that party devotion which they have had drilled into them in the last 50 years or so.

Therefore, I ask some of the members across the floor tonight to think very long and hard before they make their decision on this matter. If the government goes down to defeat tomorrow night they will lose a Prime Minister and a leader. But this house must show where it stands. Should a Prime Minister or should anybody call on the police force of our country to look into the private behaviour of all M.P.'s for the last ten years so as to find whether there are any scandalous actions which can be used as a threat, to be held over their heads—as the headlines point out—for 16 months? I hope the principles to which I referred will force many members, individually and collectively, to stand up and be counted tomorrow as Liberals of this house who believe in Liberalism, not the Liberal party. Let them be counted with those of us who fight on this issue of the preservation of the rights of individuals in this house to freedom from fear of a police state.

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. gentleman who has just finished speaking? We have heard a great deal tonight about the dangers of general allegations. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he is accepting responsibility for the accuracy of the article, allegedly written by Mr. Douglas Fisher, upon which he relied so fully in the argument he has developed in the house tonight.