

when some of the members on the government front bench have the courage to speak in this debate. The first is to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Favreau).

I am wondering whether the file, or the alleged file, on the Munsinger case was presented to him during his tenure of office as Minister of Justice and, if it was presented to him, what action did he take upon it?

The second question is to the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell), a man for whom we all have a great deal of admiration and respect. I wonder whether the actual transfer of responsibility for the R.C.M.P., from the ministry of justice to the department of the Solicitor General, has taken place? I know it has not been done by legislation, but I wonder whether it has been done by administrative order. If so, has the Solicitor General seen the Munsinger file? If he has seen it, what action has he proposed?

Now, the interesting thing about this case, if there is any interest left after the vile words of the last couple of days, is the suspicion left that the minister's press conference of yesterday was part of a deliberate plan, of which the minister is chief protagonist. This suspicion is confirmed by the silence of the Minister of Justice. The suspicion is further confirmed by the insinuations, repeated many times by many hon. members, about the similarity of the Dorion inquiry to the matter before us now.

I did not happen to agree with the Minister of Justice in the way he managed, if that is the word, or behaved in connection with the Spencer case. However, I did agree that he exhibited a great deal of courage, personal courage, and loyalty to a party. If these are things to be boasted about, I think he is entitled to that credit for his courage in putting, as the papers have said, his Prime Minister and his party before his own personal inclinations. But this courage of Tuesday and Wednesday melted and slipped away on Thursday when he took part in his really quite extraordinary press interview, and so on. As a matter of fact, I do not suppose a minister has had the distinction lately in this country of being the reason for a new word creeping into the language.

In a book which a philosopher wrote about 20 or 30 years ago when other situations were facing this country, he posed the question, "When our children ask us 20 years from now what did you accomplish in those days

*Administration of Justice*

we shall perhaps be glad to answer, like the French revolutionists after the terror, 'I survived.' "

The thing that concerns me, and a great many other members, is the survival of this institution. This is what this privilege is about. Many of us who have been part of this institution for the last little while are almost inclined to despair. This is a place apparently where men can be destroyed. Not only can their future usefulness be destroyed, but those of us, the flotsam that are left after such attacks, can be destroyed in spirit, and I think this is bad for the country. I do not boast when I say this. I do not think it matters very much about me as an individual, but I think it matters a great deal about this place as an institution.

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

**Mr. Fairweather:** —and this place is being fouled.

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

● (3:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Fairweather:** Mr. Speaker, what I cannot get through my head is that there are some men here who are willing to conspire to do irreparable damage to this institution. They damage its usefulness and they damage themselves as they go about their business outside the house where they are brave men. But inside the house they have no courage. God knows, there are enough people who question this parliament and whether parliament is an institution which can survive. There are inquiries, there are columnists, and there are people dealing with this all over the world. Here we sit, locked in this unseemly mess. It does damage to this place, and yet the minister sits there without any courage to remove a smear which has been done to men of honour, two at least of whom are not even alive to answer the charge.

**An hon. Member:** Shame.

**Mr. Fairweather:** Some of us, in our way, have tried to study this by research, even by experiment, because that is what we are doing now with the new rules; we are experimenting. Here we have a mockery, a travesty of the experiment. However, we have tried in our simple way, perhaps, to make this place work so that people can regard it and respect it as an institution and so that children do not debate its usefulness.