

*Administration of Justice*

just an ordinary layman and backbencher. I once remember being told that arguments between lawyers were a layman's delight. I think this might be right. They are entertaining for a while. Whether that holds at all times I am not sure, and I am saying this in a kindly way to my friends who belong to that profession.

I should like to see some light cast on what is going on. Some of us want to know exactly what we are dealing with and what is going on. First of all, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are confused by questions of privilege before the house and this has of course confused the whole debate. We have the matter of the Munsinger case and the direct charge the minister levelled that the former prime minister mishandled this case and participated in it. Those are two direct charges the minister made. Therefore I do not think there is any great problem in the house in resolving how to proceed on these charges.

We also have the allegations that the Minister of Justice is alleged to have made in a press conference. These have to do with an entirely different matter and no investigation of the Munsinger case can clear this matter up. The situation to which I refer is the alleged statements of the minister making a blanket allegation against the conduct of every Privy Councillor who served in the government of that day. This, I think, is conduct unbecoming to our Minister of Justice.

We have asked him and we are pressing that he use the opportunity given in the house to state his charges in a definitive manner so that those who are not involved in any way whatsoever will have the cloud that they carry removed from them. Surely a man of honour, if such he be, would want to do this at the first opportunity. Why he hides behind the eloquent words of his colleagues and the confusing statements of the Prime Minister and others in this matter is something I do not understand.

What is he charging these Privy Councillors with? First of all, he said, "Well, the lady is dead". We have reason to believe today, because of evidence that has been uncovered, that this statement is false. We shall have to see definitely whether it is or is not. However, if this statement is false the Minister of Justice, having made it public at a press conference, is derelict, neglectful and unfit for the job he holds.

Surely the Minister of Justice should know better than to make a statement at a press conference or any other place if he has not the facts to base it on. It would appear now that the statement that the lady was dead is false. That is one thing. As I read events, the Minister of Justice is unfit to continue in the position he holds.

What is his charge against the Privy Councillors? Is he charging that they were responsible for a security leak? Is the charge one to the effect that they were guilty of improper moral conduct? The minister has already said that this case is worse than the Profumo case. I point out that Profumo did not have to leave the British parliament because of his improper moral conduct outside the house. He had to leave parliament because he lied to parliament. Does the minister think that any former Privy Councillor lied to parliament? If he does, he has the responsibility to get up in the house now and say so.

I do not know much about procedure but I am going to say that the house cannot itself resolve this second matter. The first one I am forgetting about and it should not be confused with the second matter. In the first one the name of a man, the former Prime Minister, has been mentioned. The second matter involves every former Privy Councillor. A blanket allegation of that kind coming from the Minister of Justice is something that he and only he can satisfy this house on by getting up and stating who the former Privy Councillors were and on what he based that allegation.

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

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings):** Mr. Speaker, I have sat here for two days and I have heard many things. As a new member who has not participated in some of the battles of the past but as a member who perhaps vicariously is affected by some of the subject matter under discussion, I rise now to say a few words. The few words I will say will be said with somewhat of a heavy heart. I say them with a heavy heart because what is going on in this house illustrates the black hand of political assassination which hit parliament and still holds parliament in its grip. That hand is a hand of the past. Others fought elections in the past and all of us here have fought the past election. But this country wants this parliament to move ahead.