

*Question of Privilege*

waited until his estimates went through before saying at a press conference what he did not dare say in this parliament.

The minister's action constitutes a breach of national security, and as such is a matter of urgent public importance and must be dealt with, I submit, sir, here and now. No other house business, no other matter of debate can take priority over the wholesale slandering, for that is what I submit it is, of a former government and a former prime minister by one holding the responsibility of a minister of justice. The minister has an obligation—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; I heard the hon. member this afternoon when he made his first contribution to this debate and, raised the matter which he considered a question of privilege, which was followed by a motion. I find it very difficult to see any difference between the question of privilege he is raising at this time and the one he raised this afternoon.

● (7:10 p.m.)

I know he might argue now that we are dealing with a different privy councillor and that every single privy councillor has a separate question of privilege. This is probably the only argument on which he can justify his entering into a debate a second time; but I should like him to take account of the fact that he has already participated in this question of privilege. I suggest the motion very properly was allowed to stand for a short while. I think the hon. member would want to consider the possibility that the motion the hon. member has already moved should be considered by the Chair. If I may say so, he is trying to duplicate his personality in the house and say that he made a motion before on behalf of one privy councillor and that he could again make a motion on behalf of not this one but another one. I have some doubt whether the hon. member can make six speeches, each time on behalf of a different privy councillor. This is beyond my comprehension; certainly, it does not appear to be very logical. Therefore, unless the hon. member is making a different contribution from that which he made this afternoon, I doubt whether he has a real question of privilege.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, since you raised the matter, and since Your Honour was not in the chair when I initially raised the matter this evening, I point out to you,

with deference, that I am rising this evening on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, who is not present in the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not want to complicate things for the hon. gentleman, but I realize he is rising on behalf of another member of the house; this is the point I am making. He is rising on behalf of another privy councillor who may feel aggrieved by the remarks which have been made by the Minister of Justice. This was my point. I wonder whether the hon. member, after he has completed his presentation now on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, then might get up a third time and say that this time he is speaking on behalf of a third privy councillor. I doubt whether this can be done.

**Mr. Nielsen:** I do not have to rise on behalf of any particular member of the privy council in this house. The only submission I have made to you this evening is on the basis that a prima facie case of privilege exists, and there has been no debate whatsoever in respect of the merits of the fundamental question of privilege raised which has to be decided by the house and, with great deference, sir, only by the house.

I am rising this evening at the first opportunity because the matter has not been placed before Your Honour previously. On this question of privilege, I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to the words used by the Minister of Justice this afternoon when he suggested to you, sir, and this house that the conduct of the former prime minister of this country should be made the subject of a royal commission inquiry.

I submit, sir, that that is an entirely distinct and separate question of privilege which has arisen as a result of the proceedings this afternoon, and not as a result of any proceedings during the minister's estimates or anything he may have said outside the house; indeed, it is additional. The minister has simply dug himself in deeper by his remarks this afternoon. I say, sir, that he cannot hide behind such wholesale smears, slanders, and allegations without fulfilling the obligation he has to make known the full facts. He has that duty and that responsibility. He must make his charges, having gone as far as he was allowed to go this afternoon in this house and outside it. He is assumed, sir, by the public as well as by the members of this house, to be in possession of the facts and to be making charges based on substance. He must, therefore, state to the members of the house what