

Question of Privilege

house going to ask what is happening so that they can be put in the picture? I suggest that the minister could have been here had he wanted.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I realize that the house is dealing with a question of privilege concerning the events of these past few days.

This afternoon I heard a former minister refer to the situation in which former Conservative ministers find themselves, with all the insinuations and implications made recently.

Perhaps they could be asked if what they have been doing for the last two years was not constant insinuations and implications.

I heard the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) say that he had never heard about the Munsinger case. It proves one thing: that the Leader of the Opposition did not keep his ministers informed when he was Prime Minister.

It also proves that the case was not investigated as it should have been and that it has not been completely cleared up, since the ministers were not even aware of it, except, as pointed out by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), the ministers involved at the time.

In my opinion, this matter should certainly be cleared up and the motion as moved this afternoon will not satisfy anyone. While you are going to consider whether the motion is in order, I should like to move an amendment so that you may consider it at the same time as the motion. You will then have all evening to decide if the amendment is just as regular as the motion. With your permission, I move the following amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member moves an amendment to the motion before the house, but it is clear that until that motion has been accepted, no member will be able to move an amendment.

An amendment to a motion cannot be moved as long as a motion is still before the house.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Grégoire: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I shall simply outline the amendment to the Conservative motion I should like to move later, so that we may all be enlightened.

The amendment would be along these lines: That every word after the word "immediately" in the motion of the hon. member

for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) be deleted and replaced by the following: That the right hon. Prime Minister take such steps as are necessary to establish a judicial inquiry into the security case referred to by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) and by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) on March 4, 1966 at page 2211 of *Hansard*, and which was also raised by the Minister of Justice in a press conference on March 10, 1966 and which was also referred to by the hon. member from Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) on orders of the day on March 10, 1966, in a question of privilege.

I submit that only a judicial inquiry into the whole Munsinger affair, can inform public opinion and show whether the Minister of Justice was right or wrong in raising a question of security which had to be in force at the time, and only a judicial inquiry will enlighten us on the role and the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition in the Munsinger case.

If the Minister of Justice is asked only to give all his evidence, everything cannot be aired. On the other hand, if a judicial inquiry is held, we will know precisely what was the role of the Leader of the Opposition at the time, whether he acted properly and whether he conducted himself as befits a Prime Minister.

If we were to ask only for a simple statement in the house, we would never have the whole story.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to have you take under advisement the advisability of the amendment I have moved, so that if this amendment is in order, we will have a judicial inquiry on everything that happened on that subject. I feel that a statement would satisfy no one.

In the last two years, the Conservatives have asked for a royal commission or a judicial inquiry at every turn. If it was a good thing each time they did the asking, so why would it not be as good a thing in this case? Would there be a double standard? If it was good in the Spencer case, why would it be bad in the Munsinger case?

I see that some Conservative members are in favour of holding a judicial inquiry in the Munsinger case.

Well, Mr. Speaker, then it would throw light on everything we want to know.

Mr. Speaker, I think that such an inquiry is needed. In view of the fact that a motion and an amendment thereto are before you,