

*Administration of Justice*

Minister of Justice, Mr. Claude Wagner. The article reads as follows:

Will Wagner clear up fully the case of the "Polonaise"?

And here I wish to add that it is not Chopin's.

It is current knowledge—

—and I am quoting textually—

—in the capital—

Quebec City.

—that the last remark made by Mr. Claude Wagner about some federal members, particularly Mr. Erik Nielsen, "I—

—here Mr. Wagner is quoted in brackets:

—"I know what he has; but he does not know all I have—", I easily find his answer. It would seem that the words "all I have", coming from the Minister of Justice, mean that he undoubtedly has a complete list of all the people connected with organized crime in Canada, whose hold over the "belle province" is getting stronger, starting from the higher ups and going down to the lowest member of the gang. That list, which will be made public later, includes the names of influential people in judicial quarters and, in informed circles, it is said openly that some ministers will soon find themselves before the court, although it is not made clear whether they are members of the provincial or the federal cabinet.

More and more, there is talk also about the "Polonaise"—

Not Chopin's.

—who would be involved in fraudulent bankruptcies and arson cases.

And all I can tell you is that things have been stirred up.

Following that article and the comments by Mr. Wagner about that matter, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister or, if he is not here, to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin). Within the limits of the inquiry, within the terms of reference, which the government has in mind, will it be possible to get the documents of the Quebec Minister of Justice, and if all that is linked to the same racket, about which so much pressure was exerted from the official opposition, so that an inquiry would be set up about fraudulent bankruptcies, it might then be appropriate if there is a connection in all this, to get to the bottom of all this and clean up, once and for all, the case of fraudulent bankruptcies as well as the Munsinger affair. I should like to have a reply from the Minister of Justice on all this, that is whether he feels it would be appropriate to include everything Mr. Wagner has in his files, so as to bring to light the whole Munsinger affair and fraudulent bankruptcies if they are connected. I feel that the two matters should be included.

[Mr. Langlois (Megantic).]

Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Québec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of rising in this discussion, but in view of the position taken by the opposition, it will necessarily keep on at least until six o'clock tonight. I want to endorse the words of the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) to the effect that the work of the house is progressing very slowly. When he makes this remark, I think he should understand that, for the last three years, due precisely to lack of seriousness and insinuations which have been made and personal matters which have been raised in this house, particularly by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), I have the feeling the Canadian people could stand one day's delay more or less to put an end to all these personal questions and return to the normal pursuance of the business of the house.

I also have the feeling that much more is being learned through the radio at this time and I respectfully submit, after all the speeches made by the members of the New Democratic Party, that the Munsinger affair would have been brought to light in any case, as is being done now by the press and that, at one time, we would have heard the members of the New Democratic Party and of the Conservative party accuse the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin).

Yet, those members spent 15 days discussing the Spencer case, that is the case of an alleged spy, simply because they would have received from someone a telegram saying he had been badly treated. For fifteen days, they sided with the Conservative party, just to examine that matter. But today they are opposed to the setting up of an inquiry proposed by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) and offered by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). That is the stand they take, while for 15 days they maintained that the Spencer case should be dealt with in a non-partisan manner and by means of a judicial inquiry.

Then, why not refer this one to an independent judicial inquiry, a commission made up of non-partisan people, in order to clear it up once and for all and so that we may return to the business of the house?

I hope also that this will be a lesson to the hon. member for Yukon and show him that a member is not here for the sole purpose of making insinuations while hiding behind parliamentary immunity.