

*The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker*

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** —whatever that is. This process, Sir, used to be called bundling.

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** In the early days of the New England states, young men and women could not get together when they first engaged in a courtship, so they occupied the same bed, with a board between them. That was bundling. This is modern bundling, or "an organic understanding". Mark you, I want to be fair to the Minister of Justice, because a minister of justice knows the meaning of words. He said that it was not so much that he wanted to talk about the current situation, oh, no; he just wanted to look into the recesses of the mind of the hon. member for York South and see if he could find out what he thought. Was that not a delightful exercise? There was the Minister of Justice, a political phrenologist.

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I will not read these reports. A headline says, "Lang on carpet". That is no place for the Minister of Justice. Anyway, he was communicated with.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Lewis:** Never mind, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for York South was seeking the floor on a question of privilege, but he has now withdrawn his request. The right hon. gentleman has the floor.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interfere with a point of order from anybody on the subject of the study of phrenology. Anyway, those two got together and they talked. They shuffled and juggled and jiggled, apparently just short of marriage, and the hon. member for York South decided not to accept any "organic understanding". Well, this was one of the most unusual gatherings that ever took place. On the one hand there was the suppliant, and on the other one who was like Warwick. After all, Mr. Speaker, those who sit opposite live by the grace of the NDP.

• (1530)

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I do not criticize in any way the vote on the motion to adjourn, but I do want to point out something to the members of the NDP and it is this! The leader of the NDP said that as far as he was concerned he wanted to assure that parliament would live, and that is admirable. He wanted to assure that the Liberals should have an opportunity of bringing in their legislation. While I disagree with that, none the less, there is nothing improper about that whatsoever. I do want to point out that the leader of the NDP on November 16 said this:

It would be improper for Mr. Trudeau to ask for dissolution if he's defeated.

He agrees that he said that, and as a constitutional authority I accept his view.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** He went on to state:

It's his duty to advise the Governor General to call on Mr. Stanfield to form a government.

There can be no argument about that, but what happened when the Prime Minister stood here the other day? He produced a monstrous doctrine that in the event the government was defeated on anything of importance, and he referred to one or two matters, then he would go to the country. There was not one suggestion that if the defeat were within the first couple of weeks, the first month or the first two or three months, as one or two members of the NDP had mentioned outside the House, that then the Governor General would call upon the Leader of the Opposition. There was nothing of the kind. The Prime Minister threw overboard any suggestion that the Leader of the Opposition could become Prime Minister as a result of the defeat of the government.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Shame.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** On the original motion that is now before the House, if the government gets a vote of confidence then as far as the Prime Minister is concerned that is the end of the ball game here. He will stay on and on until defeated and then will go to the country. The Leader of the NDP stipulated this, and rightly so, that if the defeat came within a short time after parliament opened, then the Governor General should call upon the Leader of the Opposition. On the basis of that, I can understand the vote on the adjournment, but today that has been changed and Caesar says: If I am defeated I will go the country. Mr. Speaker, that proposition is one that is a denial of democratic government.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** The time allotted to the right hon. member has expired. He can continue with the consent of the House.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I again ask members of the NDP to give reconsideration to their stand in that the Prime Minister has departed from the initial premise that was declared by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). What is going to happen here is this: the Prime Minister will get his vote of confidence, that is clear now after the vote on the adjournment motion, and whatever he does, more or less, or little or more, if at any time defeated he will do one of two things. First, he may resurrect that monstrous doctrine of 1968 which I opposed to the limit, the right of the government after defeat on a budget item to come back to parliament after three days of grace and ask parliament to vote confidence. He has already indicated that I said that is what he would do when I spoke three days after the election. After all, I have not the time to read Machiavelli today, but I have heard the Prime Minister say over and over again what a great politician Machiavelli was. Machiavelli said, among other things:

Hence it is necessary for a prince wishing to hold his own to know how to do wrong, and to make use of it or not according to necessity.