

Administration of Justice

inquiry by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, can hope to cope with the sweeping charges made by the Minister of Justice unless it requires the attendance of all Privy Councillors of the previous administration, past and present, and that specific charges must be brought against those to whom the minister referred when he made his statement to the press.

The Minister of Justice must name names if it is expected we will ever get anywhere with that matter. He must substantiate what he has said or he must resign. This is what I was referring to, as I believe the minister knows.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. member mention any citation in any of the authorities which gives the slightest justification for the course which he, in his pontifical fashion, suggests must be followed by the minister? The other day Your Honour recited Mr. Speaker Michener's famous ruling and there is certainly no warrant for such a course there. Mr. Speaker Michener said there must be a specific motion and we do not have such a motion before us today. The hon. member put a question to me and I will reply to it if I am permitted to do so. The only charge which I have seen is the charge by the Minister of Justice that the Leader of the Opposition mishandled a security case.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: I know of no other charge. If the hon. member does, let him state it instead of making these insinuations.

Mr. Nielsen: I do not know where the Minister of Transport was yesterday. I put them on record yesterday.

An hon. Member: Read them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest to hon. members that the debate should be carried on without any shouting from one side of the chamber to the other.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister should read them; they are on the record. It was not simply a charge that the previous prime minister mishandled this case. There is a charge, appearing at page 2211 of *Hansard*, that the Leader of the Opposition, when he was prime minister, participated in the Munsinger case.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: There was a charge by the Minister of Justice that more than two Privy Councillors are involved in this case and that

it is worse in some respects than the Profumo affair. I listed many more examples in *Hansard* yesterday. When I made reference to specific charges—the hon. gentleman knows this—what it was intended he should understand was that the minister had an obligation before any proceedings can be taken to name the ministers he thinks are involved, without having had reference to the files, and a further obligation to substantiate the charges he has made both inside and outside this house.

One of the outstanding political commentators in the minister's own province, Mr. Claude Ryan of *Le Devoir*, said this morning in analysing the minister's conduct, and I quote a translation:

Instead of following a line of conduct dictated by logic and tradition, Mr. Cardin performed one after the other, (coup sur coup) two acts which showed his real stature, that of a small-time politician (petit politicien) of partisan spirit.

And again:

Already, the manner in which the minister last week revived the Munsinger affair was disgraceful (disgracieuse) and unworthy of a Minister of the Crown.

Yesterday, the minister went farther. Making use of information which he did not officially possess, dealing with files not under his authority, he accused "a number" of former Conservative ministers of having been involved in an incident about which he admits he knows neither the details nor the exact significance. Without having consulted his Cabinet colleagues he demands an inquiry into the Munsinger affair, exposing himself once again to a new repulse from a leader acting only through fear and opportunism.

Mr. Ryan refers to the statement that the minister was tired of charges by the Leader of the Opposition that the Liberals were plunged in scandal. Then he goes on:

Coming from a man to whom this country has confided the administration of justice and who enjoys, on account of his position, extremely powerful instruments of pressure, such proposals are absolutely unacceptable.

This is not just the opinion in the province of Quebec; it is the opinion across this country. The editorial I have just read, written by a noted editorial writer in the minister's own province, sums up precisely the case for the opposition in this affair, that a minister shall not use his high office to blacken with impunity members of this parliament. I point out to hon. gentlemen on my left in the Ralliement Creditiste and in the Social Credit party—

An hon. Member: One o'clock.