

Administration of Justice

Mr. Lambert: You are not involved yourself.

Mr. Caouette: Fifty Lamberts; I am not afraid of Lambert syrup.

Mr. Lambert: We are not interested in loud-mouths.

[*English*]

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, being one member in this house who has had some experience with a judicial inquiry such as the Prime Minister has suggested, I would like to say a few words to the front benches on this side, through you Mr. Speaker, and issue a word of warning. Before I do so I also would like to refer the house to an article written by Doug Fisher in December 1963. He was talking about judicial inquiries—you laugh; go ahead. This is what he says in respect of this type of inquiry, and it was in January 1964 he wrote this article:

It seems the Liberals felt that an inquiry of the right kind, for the right period, might open a can of worms—

I suggest this is the reason the Prime Minister made this suggestion. Then he goes on further to say:

A strange thing that a committee designed to check into a question of privilege (i.e. into a personal insult) ends up asking for an investigation into a phase of the Department of Agriculture.

I mention this, Mr. Speaker, to point out what can happen with these so-called judicial inquiries. I have said in this house many times that they are not judicial inquiries, that they are political inquiries, and last night as I saw the Minister of Transport and the Prime Minister walking into this house—as I saw the Minister of Transport walking into this house licking his lips—I knew that history was repeating itself; it was the establishment again coming up with some idea of how to get out of this mess and how they could, by suggesting a judicial inquiry, shove it off on to some unbeknown judge who would work on their behalf.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and the former Minister of Justice are jumping in their seats—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

23033—162

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, a suggestion has been made that a judge would be placed in the position—

Mr. McIntosh: I have the floor—

Mr. Nicholson: On the question of privilege, the hon. member suggested that a member of the judiciary of this country would be made a tool of this government. By doing so he reflects on the government and on our judiciary.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In general terms, the hon. member knows no comment should be made which reflects on the judiciary.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. McIntosh: I will not withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, because I made no accusation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIntosh: I said I believe something, and I still believe it. I would point out that in the composition of this judicial inquiry I was talking about the commissioner at that time was a defeated Liberal candidate, and all his legal counsel were either defeated Liberal candidates or—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I cannot allow the hon. member to continue this line of argument. I want to remind him, and all hon. members, that I have allowed all hon. members from all parties represented in the house on both sides of the chamber to participate in this debate this morning, following upon the ruling which I delivered shortly after eleven o'clock. Now there is still nothing before the house. The only way this debate can continue would be if a new question of privilege were raised, because as hon. members realize, in the course of yesterday, we were discussing a specific question of privilege that was held in abeyance to give the Chair an opportunity to study the motions which were made subsequent thereto. Certainly we must reach a point where an item has to come before the house, since there is nothing now. Unless a new question of privilege is raised, I would suggest to hon. members that we should call orders of the day.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to Your Honour that the question of privilege that was raised yesterday is still before Your Honour and still before the house.