

*Administration of Justice*

**Mr. Brewin:** If he does know, then why should the suspicion not be removed from those who are not charged and not affected by this matter so that they do not have to be condemned by the senior law officer of the Crown in Canada by a blanket aspersion against them? We should be sure that there is no attempt to deal with this matter in the Committee on Privileges and Elections where the chaos might exceed even what we have seen in the house. That is not the right way to do it. Let the government choose a judicial officer of the highest calibre and let him deal with this matter. But before that let us have it perfectly clear that the grave matter which this house is now discussing, the matter of the imputations made by the Minister of Justice in his press conference, is incorporated in the terms of reference, and that these imputations must be specific and not under the guise of some generalities.

I have had enough experience with judges and I respect them, most of them in any event, despite what one hon. member said. I know their approach to these things. If they can limit the matter or cut it down they will do so. As I say, right in the terms of the inquiry we should have the charges and they should not be the general charges we have heard so far; they should be specific charges within the minister's knowledge and based on the files he controls. If there are no such charges then he should withdraw and resign.

**Mr. McIntosh:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the last speaker a question? The hon. member made reference to me and my thought in respect of judges. I am not quite sure he knows what my position is so far as judges are concerned. I would ask him, as a result of his remarks this morning, whether he disagrees with the editorial which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* today and particularly the part which says:

But an inquiry is no longer sufficient.

This is what the people of Canada are thinking. The editorial goes on to say, and again I repeat this is what the people of Canada are thinking:

Never in the history of Canada's parliament has a cabinet minister behaved with more irresponsibility than Mr. Cardin. The Munsinger case was to come before a judicial inquiry. He took it away from that inquiry. But he did not take it before the jury of parliament. No. He took it to the jury of rumor and scandal-mongering, on hearsay evidence, and in cold blood after a full night's consideration. Canada's Justice Minister did this.

Mr. Cardin must resign.

But his resignation will not, in itself, restore confidence in the government. Mr. Cardin told the *Globe* reporter—

[Mr. Brewin.]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. McIntosh:**

—that Mr. Pearson—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I think the hon. member now should proceed to the question he was going to ask.

**Mr. Lambert:** He asked it.

**Mr. McIntosh:** Mr. Speaker, I will repeat it. I ask the hon. member for Greenwood whether he agrees with what I have already read from this editorial, particularly the last sentence which says:

Mr. Pearson appeared as little more than a "me-too" accomplice in a smear campaign.

I am suggesting to the member for Greenwood in respect of a judicial inquiry that with his experience in such inquiries he knows—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. McIntosh:** My question—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is a very long and extended question.

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer the question by saying that, however good the editorial is, I am not trying to express opinions or make judgments as an editorial writer. I have nothing but respect for the Minister of Justice and I am sorry he has got himself into the mess he has. I am directing myself to a question of principle. I do not intend to associate myself with an editorial, although it may be just. The aspect I am dealing with is how this house can get out of the mess it is in.

**Mr. McIntosh:** Does the hon. member for Greenwood not agree that a judicial inquiry such as that proposed by the Prime Minister and instigated by the Minister of Transport would end up in more of a smear?

**Mr. Brewin:** I really cannot anticipate what a judicial inquiry would end up in. All I can say is that this is the best known procedure we have for investigating facts which have to be investigated.

**Mr. Greene:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order before the minister speaks, just a moment before the Minister of Agriculture rose the Minister of Justice wanted to rise and you did not recognize him. I suggest that maybe he should now be heard.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Minister of Agriculture is recognized by the Chair.