

*Administration of Justice*

That is precisely what it will be taken to mean.

Sir, I appeal to hon. members to accede to the suggestion of the hon. member for Kamloops because there is no one in this party, indeed in any quarter in the house according to my observation, who is opposed to an inquiry into this case. But is there to be no protection accorded to members of the house? Are they not to have the protection afforded under the ordinary law to the ordinary citizens of this country, because that is what is being denied by these terms of reference?

Are they to be summoned to prove their innocence of involvement, whatever that means, when there has been no specific statement that there was a security risk and when the Order in Council itself talks about a security risk that "may have been"? Is this a ground on which people can be summoned to appear and to defend themselves? This is merely a device by which members of the house, innocent or guilty, can be dragged down on unspecified charges, undefined allegations, and spurious and unfounded assertions. This is an action by the government to remove from parliament the disposal of the privileges of parliament and to use the machinery of justice to destroy the opposition.

This order is without parallel, sir, in the annals of any civilized country, in the annals of any democracy since the days of the star chamber, with no offences, not one single offence, being charged.

**An hon. Member:** Oh, quit.

**Mr. Nielsen:** An hon. member says "quit". That is his concept of justice.

**Mr. Tremblay:** What is yours?

**Mr. Nielsen:** The hon. member asks what is mine. I will tell hon. members opposite what my concept of justice is. It is that no subject of this country, member of this house or otherwise, shall be dragged before any judicial body in this country and required to prove his innocence.

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

**Mr. Munro:** May I ask the hon. member a question? At any time during his past behaviour in this house prior to the last election and during the conduct of the election has he ever dragged down the reputation of hon. members on unspecified and unfounded charges?

[Mr. Nielsen.]

**Mr. Nielsen:** Here we go again—

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

**Mr. Nielsen:** —with the deliberate misconstruction of hon. members opposite.

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

**Mr. Nielsen:** And they laugh. I say they can take part in this discussion and read what I said into the record. On page 4 of the report of the commission which was set up for the purpose of inquiring into the charges that I made in the house there is set forth what I said in the house at that time, something which the Minister of Justice in this case did not have the courage to do. I said on that occasion:

The executive assistant to the minister at that time, Mr. Raymond Denis, offered a bribe in the amount of \$20,000 to counsel who was acting for the United States government on the bail application with the request that he would not oppose the bail proceedings—

That was a specific charge.

**Mr. Munro:** Now read page 10534 of the same *Hansard*.

**Mr. Nielsen:** The hon. member will have an opportunity to engage in this discussion. It was on the basis of the charges I made, the names I named, the dates and places I specified, and the sections of the Criminal Code I specified during those days of debate that that commission was struck, and also because of the questions of the leader of the N.D.P. There is no parallel between that case, where a member of the opposition was discharging his responsibility to expose what he had an obligation to expose, and this case where the Minister of Justice, a member of the treasury benches, makes unfounded charges against all Privy Councillors past and present, dead and alive. The terms of reference of this Order in Council do not specify. It does not say who is guilty or what they are guilty of or even whether there has been an offence of any kind or description.

It sets out in its own language the statements made by the minister at his press conference and alters the substance of those statements in order to remove responsibility from the minister. That is precisely what this Order in Council does. In its vagueness, its lack of specification, its failure to name names, to state any offence, and its deliberately vague and suggestive generalities, it represents the ultimate betrayal of every principle of human rights, the right of the