

Administration of Justice

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Fulton: And in the light of the attitude revealed there I am not surprised that the administration of justice has been degraded to the lowest level in the history of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Fulton: I have seen too much of the results arising from the fact that the Minister of Justice and his Prime Minister operate in watertight compartments and wait until there is a casual reference made in the back seat of a plane in respect of something involving people next to government. I did not regard it as fulfilling my duty to my prime minister to leave him in the dark concerning things that were said.

An hon. Member: About what?

Mr. Fulton: I am waiting to hear the Minister of Justice tell us.

Mr. Pearson: You were the minister.

Mr. Fulton: There we have the same old implications.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggested when the hon. member took the floor that the purpose of the discussion was to consider the terms of reference of the proposed inquiry. I would ask the hon. member who has the floor to limit his statements to that.

Mr. Fulton: Yes, sir; but I regret that I see the same implication as that raised by the Minister of Justice earlier this evening—"we make the smear; you do the explaining". What an appalling suggestion to come from the front bench of those opposite.

Then I think there should be included in the terms of reference of this commission the question of the circumstances surrounding the administration of Mrs.—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fulton: The admission of Mrs. Munsinger.

Mr. Starr: She was a security risk and you let her in and paid her way over.

Mr. Churchill: Who was the minister of citizenship and immigration in 1955—the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill).

Mr. Fulton: Let me fill in the ellipsis surrounding my words. The administration of the government of Canada at the time of the admission of Mrs. Munsinger was a Liberal

administration and Mrs. Munsinger was admitted under the aegis of my hon. friends opposite; yet, we are now told by them that Mrs. Munsinger was a security risk before she came.

An hon. Member: In what year?

Mr. Fulton: In 1955, I understand. Who was the minister?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: We are now told—and it is one of the implications in the charge—that she was a spy engaged in espionage activities and there were security reports about her long before she came. Who let her in?

An hon. Member: Let there be no mystery about that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Fulton: Whom the cap fits, let him wear it.

Mr. Pickersgill: On a question of personal privilege—

● (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. My understanding is that we are on the question of privilege. I have heard, during the last two or three days, members get up on questions of privilege. On Friday afternoon the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre raised a question of personal privilege when we already had a question of privilege before the house.

Mr. Churchill: Am I being singled out for admonition?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest there is one question of privilege at the moment and that we should limit ourselves to that particular question. When we have settled that one perhaps we will go on to another, such as the one the Minister of Transport wishes to raise at this time.

I have given some thought to this and I suggest there is no basic difference between a question of privilege affecting hon. members of the house and a question of personal privilege. When the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre raised his point the other day I asked whether there was any distinction which would allow the hon. member to interrupt the question of privilege then before the house. In this regard I suggested to him at that time that we should limit our discussion to the question then before us, and I suggest again that we now limit ourselves for the moment to the question raised by the hon. member for Kamloops.