

Administration of Justice

I have not met the Minister of Justice personally but I have heard many high tributes about him previously. Why then, after the Prime Minister resolved the difficulty the house was in one week ago, did the Minister of Justice resurrect the coals and stir up innuendos and insinuations which obviously would be provocative? It must have been obvious that his logic when he did that and his good sense and reason went out the window.

• (3:00 p.m.)

If this parliament illustrates anything and if this debate illustrates anything, they illustrate that the political passions of the past are polluting the problems of the present. I refer to political passions because obviously there must be some other passions which are affecting the present.

I have the highest regard for the Prime Minister as a person but I have been disappointed in him in this debate. I have been disappointed that he has come forward and has again tried to justify the untenable position of the Minister of Justice. As for the Minister of National Health and Welfare, I disagree with some of the remarks of my colleague from Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis). I think the Minister was trying to exercise some reason and moderation. Nova Scotia is a land of moderation because there they have a lot of difficulties. The people of Nova Scotia move in moderate ways. I expected the minister to exercise some logic and moderation in this debate. However, in listening to his words with interest I was somewhat disappointed when he did not go one step farther in explaining the alternatives that this house could follow in order to get out of this morass of political name calling. He did not go that one step farther, and I would ask him as a newcomer why it would be wrong for the Minister of Justice or the Prime Minister to stand up and name the two or the one who are affected in a vicarious way?

This whole matter is causing concern. Allegations have been made about the conduct of Privy Councillors and it is suggested that some of them come before a royal commission. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are some members of the Privy Council who will never be able to appear before a commission. That is what I am directing the attention of the house and of the Prime Minister to and that is why this matter has to be cleaned up.

In talking in homes, any homes, or in reading the local newspapers it is apparent [Mr. Nowlan.]

that this matter should be cleared up. Whether it is this minister or that, it should be cleared up. If there are men, they ought to be named.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nowlan: That is why I should like to know from the Minister of National Health and Welfare what would be wrong with that type of situation? As I say, what is happening in parliament is causing great concern across the country. There is sickness at the morass we are in. I should like the minister to answer that because there are many who perhaps can justify themselves who have left the government. We have a Lieutenant Governor in the land today who is a Privy Councillor. Also in defence we have another Lieutenant Governor who unfortunately will never be called before a judicial committee. And there are others who will never march before the judicial committee proposed by the Prime Minister.

This party has made it clear that it is in favour of a judicial committee. The debate which took place between the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister clearly shows that we are in favour of a royal commission on security. But this personal passion, and battles of the past, pervert the thinking and logic of today and it cannot continue. I submit that hon. members opposite should use their basic common sense—and there are many hon. members opposite with basic common sense—and listen to the allegations. They should listen to the names of those involved, and then let us have an inquiry so that this matter can be cleaned up once and for all.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to my colleague from Digby-Annapolis-Kings. Is he aware that my objection to the presence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, (Mr. MacEachen) who has made an unquestionably poor attempt today to defend the Minister of Justice, (Mr. Cardin) is because of the promise of the minister, along with the minister of mines, to go to Nova Scotia to look after the welfare of 6,000 miners, a matter which he has sidestepped in order to attempt to defend a minister here.

Mr. Nowlan: I might point out that there are 20 million people whose welfare is now concerned in this debate and whose problems will remain unresolved because of it.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, that prompts a further question.