

is sitting. We will not allow them to know what the charges are here. We will not allow them to see the files and the records upon which, if there is any basis, these charges must be based."

Sir, I find it difficult to find words to describe what has been attempted. This invitation for the next government elected, when we are that government, to hunt through the files to see whether we can find anything embarrassing to members of the former government, will be rejected by us. Who of us would be so conceited as to say that there could never be found anything to embarrass us? But democratic government will not work on that basis. As I say, if this course is persisted in we are facing the ruination of our system and of this institution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the allegations that have been made? They involve the privileges especially of members of the former government, though of all members of the house. Are they allegations which are being made in the heat of the moment? Or are they being made as the result of a deliberate decision backed up by the whole government, and backed up with the authority of the Prime Minister? They are in that second category. The practice which is now being followed constitutes an invitation to reply to the threat, now being implemented, by saying that we will tell all we know. Sir, we will not. We will not follow this tactic. However, let me remind the Prime Minister that when we assumed office there were plenty of security files. Let me remind the Prime Minister that never once did we mention them, and we do not intend to do so now.

Mention of the Munsinger case by name was first made in this house on March 4 by the present Minister of Justice. Even then he used the wrong name. That mention, sir, was not accidental. It was not done in the heat of the moment as the result of a sudden provocation. All along a deliberate course has been followed, the background to which was revealed by the Prime Minister on Friday when he clearly proved that the government had long ago decided they were going, to paraphrase his words, "to teach the opposition a lesson no matter how disastrous the consequences".

Mr. Pearson: When did I say that? Would the hon. gentleman quote my words in that respect?

Mr. Fulton: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The words about provocation are to be found at page

Administration of Justice

2547 of *Hansard* for March 11. I have them before me. The Prime Minister said:

I have before me a great many clippings of statements made by members opposite about cleaning up the mess, prosecuting wrongdoers and international crime getting into the office of the Prime Minister—all that kind of thing. Were names named then? Of course they were not. We have been subjected to this kind of treatment now, for too long over here. And reputations have been ruined over here.

Then he went on:

Now those gentlemen on the other side of the house who have been so free with their accusations over the last few years are getting a little of it, and they don't like it.

Now, sir, I would ask whether words could more clearly establish that this course was deliberately embarked upon and that it had the approbation and support of the Prime Minister. Nothing, sir, could more clearly prove that accusation than the words he uttered on that occasion. Of course it has been deliberate.

It has been mentioned outside, and I will mention it here, that some eight days before, when the case was first mentioned on Friday, March 4 by the Minister of Justice, I was asked to go to the office of the President of the Privy Council to discuss the matter of the Spencer case. In the course of the conversation that ensued I was told in effect that if we persisted in discussing the Spencer case, and persisted in the course of asking for a judicial inquiry, members on that side of the house—on the government side would feel impelled to name the Munsinger case.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Fulton: I said to him at that time that members of the government must accept responsibility for their own actions, and we would accept responsibility for our present and previous actions. I said at that time, "Surely this sort of thing must and should be ended by your following the proper course, the course of appointing a judicial inquiry to remove the cloud that hangs over the head of your own Minister of Justice, of whom it has been said by Mr. Spencer that the Minister of Justice, did not dare to prosecute because if he did, heads would roll."

I invited the President of the Privy Council to end the kind of discussion that had been going on—to end it and to end the possibility of this name-calling process by appointing a judicial inquiry that would end the discussion and remove the cloud. That, sir, was not done. The debate continued, and was followed up with the naming of the case in this