

*Administration of Justice*

Spencer case. At that time there were provocations of all types which, in fact, brought out the word Monseignor, and it was not planned because, if I had planned it, I would have said Munsinger, not Monseignor. And, Mr. Speaker, I can give the house my word that this had not been a planned method of bringing out this case. I am not saying that I had not thought of it before or that I did not know of it before, but I had not intended to use it at that time.

There is also this point, Mr. Speaker. I have been accused of being a coward, afraid to get up, and of having chosen a moment when the Leader of the Opposition had gone out fishing, in order to make my statement. This is what the Leader of the Opposition stated I did. Well, Mr. Speaker, I had mentioned the Munsinger affair while the right hon. gentleman was sitting right in front of me.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Cardin:** And how am I to know—I am not that much interested in the activities of the right hon. gentleman—how am I to know he is going fishing? How was I to know where he was that Thursday morning? I had what is called a press conference to explain my withdrawal and my resumption with the government, in connection with the Spencer case. The press asked many questions of me—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Did the Prime Minister know you were going to do this?

**Mr. Cardin:** No, Mr. Speaker, the real point at issue is this: I have charged the Leader of the Opposition with having mishandled this case, and he has stated today that there were no aspects of security in this case. I want that to be remembered. I actually charged him with this, and I also had the courage to put my seat on those allegations.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Cardin:** And if the right hon. gentleman wishes to put his seat on the results of the judicial inquiry, then we will know who has courage, and who has not, in this country.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Cardin:** I have also been accused of being afraid to name members of the house. Believe me, I was not afraid and, as a matter of fact, one of the members has already been mentioned. But I do not believe that is the right thing to do. I do not believe it is right to bring out in public the names of people

[Mr. Cardin.]

such as this, and if there are other names involved in the file—and believe me, I can tell the hon. member for Kamloops there is such a file—if there are other names then let these names be given to the judges in a judicial inquiry. That is the best, the proper and the fairest way in order to deal with this matter.

The Leader of the Opposition, in a great gesture—and it was quite funny—was asking, “Is it you—is it you?” The right hon. gentleman knows who it was.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

• (4:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Cardin:** He has seen the file.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, and ask the hon. minister to mention the two or more cabinet ministers here and let us have no more of these innuendos.

**Mr. Cardin:** The right hon. gentleman has seen the file; he knows the Privy Councillors. All he has to do is tell us which ones of these Privy Councillors had nothing to do with it. This is what he should have done in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, had the Leader of the Opposition acted properly in the first place, then the Privy Councillors would not have been put in the predicament in which they are. The Leader of the Opposition is the one who is solely responsible for that position of the Privy Councillors.

**Mr. Nugent:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Justice repeat the rest of the charges he gave to the press, and we will find out how honest he is.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I am just wondering whether hon. members would expect the Speaker, at this time, after the speeches which have been made and the very crucial or difficult moments we have lived through the last few days, and today, to remind hon. members that a number of motions were made on questions of privilege.

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker, before you rule, something was said a moment ago which I simply do not think can go by. I am astounded, dismayed and sickened to hear a person who occupies the position of Minister of Justice assert the proposition that all he has to do—and still suggest that his conduct is perfectly right—is to issue a general smear affecting some 26 people, and that then the way to clear it up is for the Leader of the