

*Administration of Justice*

no one had suggested at that time and which was not even decided upon until Monday? The hon. member should at least get his chronology right.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the record will show that not only were we discussing the desirability of setting up an inquiry to deal specifically with the Spencer case but also one to deal with national security generally. The decision was made on Monday—at least, it was announced on Monday—but the matter certainly entered the discussion during the debate.

**Mr. Winkler:** No doubt about that.

**Mr. Nielsen:** The Prime Minister has set up an inquiry to look into the Spencer case. He has announced a further royal commission into the whole field of security.

**Mr. Pearson:** Security procedures.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Yes, security procedures. That is the charge that the Minister of Justice is making, that when the Leader of the Opposition was prime minister he mishandled the Munsinger case. He accused him last Friday, of participation in the Munsinger case.

The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that the Munsinger case be put on the agenda. The Prime Minister obviously noted that suggestion because he referred to it yesterday. But it was referred to by him in a very curious and twisted form. The Prime Minister is now suggesting a third royal commission into an identical field.

**An hon. Member:** No, no.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Yes, yes. In announcing the appointment of a commission into security procedures last Monday the Prime Minister made it quite plain that such a commission would cover the whole field of security procedures and the adequacy of measures. The Minister of Justice has now charged that this case—I refer to the Munsinger case—was a bona fide case of security.

The Prime Minister said that the second commission which he announced on Monday was going to look into the whole field of security procedures. If, without having seen the file, the Minister of Justice is right and this is a bona fide case involving security, why not refer it to the second commission announced by the Prime Minister on Monday last? The Minister of Justice has criticized the actions of the Leader of the Opposition when he was prime minister in handling the case vis-à-vis its security aspects. It properly belongs as a subject of the general inquiry

announced by the Prime Minister. He has not, so far as I know, dealt with the morality aspects no doubt considering this beyond his purview. In the face of the Prime Minister's announcement on Monday last the statements made by the Minister of Justice are such as would come before the inquiry set up by the government on security measures. The Prime Minister knew this and the Minister of Justice knew it. But the minister could not wait—

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Speaker, I should like, very respectfully, to rise on a point of order. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman is not now discussing anything which has any relation to any purported question of privilege. He is making an argument that this case should be referred not to the inquiry that my right hon. friend suggested this morning but to some other inquiry. That might be an interesting matter for debate—

**Mr. Nielsen:** The Prime Minister actually held that out.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order dealing with procedure. I have listened very respectfully to hon. gentlemen opposite and I think the same standard should apply to both sides of the house.

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

**Mr. Pickersgill:** My point of order is this.

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. There is a point of order before the house.

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South):** Then on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Why not allow the minister to complete his point of order and I will recognize the hon. member after?

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South):** My question of privilege arises out of remarks just made by the Minister of Transport.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will allow the hon. member to raise his question of privilege after the minister has completed his remarks.

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South):** I would call Your Honour's attention to the fact that the rules require that an hon. member should raise a question of privilege immediately and I want to raise a question of privilege as the result of a remark made by the Minister of Transport.