

The Address—Mr. Pearson

Clean". His credentials for this role, Mr. Speaker, I suggest are not above reproach.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Who used a document which had the front page, marked "confidential", torn off it? Who was the man who praised his right-hand man in the front benches for introducing into this house and in *Hansard* a forged document which was designed to get us into trouble with our neighbours?

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The Prime Minister has not proved that it was a forged document. What he is doing now is smear by innuendo.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend tells me that it is not a forged document or that he did not know that it was a forged document at the time, I will be glad to apologize to him. He has not taken the opportunity to do so, Mr. Speaker.

The right hon. gentleman shows a moral indignation now which was strangely absent in those years from 1958 to 1962. It was strangely absent when a member of his cabinet got into difficulty and was made a senator.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I do not mind statements like that, Mr. Speaker, but that statement is untrue. The man to whom the right hon. Prime Minister refers was appointed to the Senate, following which a royal commission said that he had taken improper gains, at which time I brought it to his attention and he resigned. The same advice might be given to the Prime Minister in respect of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Asselin).

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the then secretary of state was appointed to the Senate and shortly after resigned from the Senate. I might ask the right hon. gentleman, as he has asked more than once this afternoon, what was under the carpet which required his appointment to the Senate?

I mention these things because when the right hon. gentleman takes the line he took this afternoon as the defender of morality in this chamber and attacks us on this side for our indifference to morality he should be very careful about his own record.

He also accused the government this afternoon of contempt of parliament because we were not giving the kind of information to which parliament is entitled. He posed, as an example, the question asked this afternoon about the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and took advantage of the fact that it could not be answered at once this after-

[Mr. Pearson.]

noon, to suggest that something wrong was happening to that police force, or that something bad is going on in the Department of Justice. He suggested the police were losing their spurs. Let me remind him that the police lost their horses many years ago, perhaps under the regime of my right hon. friend, although I do not know that, and I do not recall anybody in the House of Commons making an issue of that loss of horses by the R.C.M.P.

An hon. Member: What about the one on the payroll?

Mr. Pearson: An hon. member asks about a horse being on the payroll. Hon. gentlemen opposite are some of those who tried to win an election on that issue and they may try again on a similar issue.

It was more serious when the right hon. gentleman suggested that somehow an auxiliary force to police was being set up without even the knowledge of the House of Commons, and contrary to the law, and that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) refused to give information to the house regarding this matter. That is a serious charge.

If my right hon. friend will look at the statutes as revised in 1959 and the R.C.M.P. Act, chapter 54, he will find that in this statute provision is made for the establishment of an R.C.M.P. reserve by the governor in council. This statute, which gives the governor in council that authority, Mr. Speaker, was passed by the government of my right hon. friend. Action was taken in this regard by regulation, under that statute, by the minister of justice of that day, Mr. Davie Fulton, whom I will be mentioning again a little later. These regulations, which were never discussed in parliament and never brought to the attention of parliament, were made again by the government of my right hon. friend. This was the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, which is destroying parliament and our constitution. We deplored the fact that the right hon. gentleman should have done that kind of thing without informing the House of Commons, but we forgave him.

Before I move on to more important questions, there were some other matters raised by the right hon. gentleman. He was very worried indeed about a paragraph in the speech from the throne, which pays what I believe is deserved tribute to Her Majesty and indicated our loyalty and affection for Her Majesty. He claimed that we had very dubious title to put that in the speech from the throne because, as he said, the young Liberals of Canada passed a resolution to