

Morality in Government

We are supposed to be on supply, but we are discussing scandals, investigations and what not.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, \$2,400 million are being paid to the federal government as taxes by the province of Quebec. And we have two days to discuss how these taxes will be spent.

What did we speak about? Not about supply at all, nor about the budget or estimates, but about other things. There has been mudslinging from both sides, and the people have not been mentioned.

What would happen, Mr. Speaker, if elections were called on the matter under discussion for the last two days? Well I, for one, would have to tell the people in Quebec: When we should be discussing how to spend your tax money, we talk about all sorts of other things. If the people were aware of what is taking place in parliament whenever the expenditure of the people's money is under consideration, I feel that the people would demand that we close up parliament.

Mr. Allard: It gets depressing.

Mr. Grégoire: It is depressing, as the hon. member for Sherbrooke has said.

Mr. Speaker, it never fails. We thought we were clear of that sort of thing for a month at least, but no. As soon as we finish with one, off we go with another. We did not initiate this. But why are we always forced into such discussions? Why can we not finally come around to legislating for the people, instead of spending our time discussing scandals and throwing mud at the next guy?

It seems simple to me, Mr. Speaker. We are on a supply motion. The discussion was initiated on one subject. An amendment was introduced and we are required to limit ourselves to that question. Nothing is being said of any interest to the people.

Do you not think there are many people in Quebec who want to separate from the federal government? Why? Just look at what is being accomplished in this parliament: 0.00.

The right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) spoke a long time. The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) also. Has any mention been made of the peoples' taxes? No. It is becoming a habit, it seems. Unless there are changes, let us not be surprised if confederation does not long hold together, if the people become discouraged with its members of parliament. If this keeps up—

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must also rise on a point of order. The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) may not relish the subject now under discussion, but under the rules, we are restricted in this debate to the subject matter of the amendment introduced in this house. I take it for granted that the remarks the hon. member for Lapointe is making are in the nature of a preamble to what he intends to say later when he comes around to the amendment, but I should like to point out to him that under the rules, he should discuss the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, you have just confirmed my own findings. The rules are so poorly designed that if I want to speak at all, I am required to speak about scandal. You will have to admit that this is the final inconsistency and stupidity, to be forced to talk about scandals. Can we not say a few words about supply? Are we not on a supply motion? That is the main motion.

The amendment. Well, a Conservative member once again put us on this business of scandals and we have to talk about them. Mr. Speaker, the rules themselves require that. That is why I say—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not know whether I should intervene again at this time, but I shall point out to the hon. member that the rules provide, should he so wish, that he may speak to supply after tonight's vote.

Mr. Grégoire: That is the most logical thing yet, Mr. Speaker. Two days are provided to debate supply but in the final analysis, there is only one half hour after the vote, for discussion. That is marvellous. Out of two days on supply, half an hour is allowed, after the vote.

In the amendment, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is taken to task for asking for files on all kinds of things concerning the members of parliament in the last 10 years. The Prime Minister has told us his side of the story which differs from commissioner McLellan's. One of them did not explain himself well or did not tell the whole truth.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister rose to state: here is what I said. If he feels that commissioner McLellan did not tell the whole truth, it is his duty to discharge him. He has no alternative. It is either the Prime Minister or the R.C.M.P. commissioner who has to go. That is the decision facing the Prime Minister. If the R.C.M.P. commissioner has told the truth, the Prime Minister has to leave. If