

*Administration of Justice*

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The voices indicate the guilt. They know. During the two days I was away parliament almost fell to pieces. I have an unfortunate failing, being unable to hear about 75 interjections at one time. The fact is, I have made myself perfectly clear. I unequivocally repeat now that there never was a question of security in connection with this matter. What did they do? They smeared. Today my colleagues look at one another and they say, is it you? Is it you? This is fascism, Mr. Speaker, at its worst.

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** In other words, they knew that they had something; for what reason were they keeping it? Was it something to use on a future occasion? This is the only possible explanation. If there had been any interference with the security of our country, they would have revealed it. However, they kept it in cold storage, in their hearts. Mind you, this statement does not cover all the Prime Minister's colleagues. The fact that a great diplomat is supporting this kind of thing surprises me beyond anything. Throughout all the years we have crossed one another, I would not have expected to see the time when he would stand up in the house and accept this kind of thing.

● (4:00 p.m.)

What was the explanation today when he opened his remarks? He said that we have difficulties in our country in connection with national unity. What has national unity got to do with this question of charging various members of the Privy Council indiscriminately with wrong-doing approaching treason? One of our colleagues has passed on. Today he has been mentioned as one of those two or more. He is referred to as one of them; and his son, an hon. member of this house, has no right of action. There is no action that a son, however honourable be his father, can take to preserve the reputation of his father. That was the situation in the Gladstone case.

What is the measure of the smear and innuendo? I am not going to talk about lack of courage in what they do. Instead of standing up in the house and saying "These are the people"—and I would admire him if he were to do that, though I have no reason to expect him to do so—the minister remains silent.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Then the government had to work out a way whereby they could get the matter before parliament, and they chose the letter way. As long as the Prime Minister has been in office he has followed the course of writing letters to people or having people write letters to him. He has these penpals, and there have been several of them. I can just imagine him, Mr. Speaker, sitting around the table with his cabinet, and saying: "Now, how about a letter? You tell me about it, and I will tell them in the house". I can imagine the Minister of Justice saying: "I cannot tell them myself because I would lose my hide, so I can write you and you can tell them".

The Minister of Justice gave a press conference. That must have been arranged beforehand; nobody ever produced a press conference like this one without some activation. Did the Prime Minister know of this press conference in advance? I was informed that the Minister of Justice left the cabinet meeting that morning before he called the press conference. I go away to the hinterland to enjoy the salubrious atmosphere of northern British Columbia, and suddenly I get a telegram.

**Mr. Winch:** Do not call that the hinterland.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** If the Prime Minister knew about this—and there has been no denial—then it is one of the most terrible things in public life. If he did not know, then he should have fired the minister within 24 minutes of his finding out about it.

When this case was first mentioned I told him to go ahead and threaten. I said let us go into the whole field of security—and I will be dealing with that in a moment too. But the government did not institute an inquiry; they held off. According to Richard Jackson, they "dropped a bombshell".

The *Ottawa Journal* for March 10 outlines how serious the situation is, and indicates that the minister said that the Munsinger case was worse than the Profumo scandal. Possibly the Minister of Justice knows about that. Then the *Journal* goes on to report that the justice minister then said:

In some ways it was worse.

The report asked whether there had been an actual security leak, to which the minister replied:

I don't know—but there definitely was a security—leak.

**Mr. Favreau:** You mean security risk.