

Supply—Justice

regarding this subject. I believe the television interview to which the hon. member for Royal makes reference took place in the latter part of November. Therefore I cannot accept once again the comments of the hon. member for York South. I can only assume that he was misinformed when he cited to this house that the Minister of Justice first mentioned this man's name on television, even before newspaper reports. That is not the case. In view of that I think they have not given the full facts of the matter.

An hon. Member: Do not answer the question.

Mr. Cashin: Mr. Chairman, I have strayed from the subject as a result of questions asked by hon. members from different parts of the house. However, as was pointed out very ably today by the Leader of the Opposition, I am young and lack a considerable amount of experience. Perhaps I cannot field this kind of questioning as ably as others, but I know that the house will bear with me and have some sympathy for me in this matter until I find myself in a better position.

An hon. Member: You have dropped them all; you have not even got one.

Mr. Cashin: My suggestion, which I should like to see carried out in future cases of this kind, is that there should be more study given to these questions by the government, and a better approach taken to them, which could perhaps involve a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or the Exchequer Court of Canada, or perhaps a judge of a provincial supreme court who has experience in government administration. Members of the opposition might suggest that this would be distinguishing between one judge and another.

Mr. Woolliams: I think that it would be.

Mr. Cashin: We now hear from the hon. member for Bow River, that great legal authority who has supplanted the hon. member for Kamloops and the hon. member for Yukon, who are neck and neck in the battle for the booby prize, as the chief spokesman. I admire the styles of both these hon. gentlemen very much, although I think they have nevertheless—and this may be some source of regret to their master—fallen into insignificance in comparison with the masterful performer who has just intervened. As a young member of Parliament I might say that it is a

[Mr. Cashin.]

great tragedy to me to know that at least in a mathematical sense I will perhaps be a member here in this house at some future date to see, sitting right opposite where the right hon. gentleman sits, some of those members like the hon. member for Yukon and the hon. member for Bow River. At that time I will be happily able to look back over the years and think of the time when they had a really masterful and skilled politician at the helm.

An hon. Member: He is getting into high gear now.

Mr. Cashin: It has been a real pleasure to have been here for the past couple of years to witness that really masterful politician and his performance, and I am glad to have had the opportunity of questioning that master once in a while, particularly when his speech has not been up to par, so as to give him an opportunity to show his wit to a greater extent to further entertain the house. As a young member of parliament I do not regret one little bit being the straight-man for such a tremendous performer as the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Knowles: How could a Grit be straight?

Mr. Cashin: Now, gentleman, I shall return to this matter of civil liberty. It seems to me that the kind of thing we should consider in future cases of this kind is the kind of in camera hearing that people want today, presided over by either a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or a provincial justice who has had experience in government administration. Perhaps such a judge with this sort of qualification is the present chief justice of Nova Scotia. Perhaps that kind of a judge with particular experience in this kind of matter could be helpful in dealing with problems in this very difficult area.

There has been a lot of discussion to the effect that such an inquiry should take place in respect of the present case. As I said earlier, I am satisfied that this is not necessary in the present case. I am also prepared to admit that the procedure followed for some 20 years is perhaps not the right procedure. I am quite sure that the hon. member for York South, knowing of his record and having heard speeches he has made, does not agree with me. I am sure that he does not agree with the procedures that have been followed over the past 20 years; but he does not agree with much of anything. He just