

Administration of Justice

Some of us care whether or not this is a place of excellence—a funny, old fashioned term, a funny, old fashioned thing—to say, excellence; but there are some of us here who seek it.

Mr. Herridge: Good old Victorian term.

Mr. Fairweather: The hon. member might be permitted to slip in occasionally one of his dangerous philosophies related to a Victorian term. I use that term, whether it is Victorian or what it is. I emphatically deplore our record, and I say “our record”, because we have all been smeared by this type of thing. We are all a little lesser people because of it. We all have to go home to our constituencies and try to explain away our strange week here. We have to tell people what we have been about.

What in God's name have we been about here this week? What have we been up to this week? We have been witnessing a conspiracy enjoyed by a frustrated minister who wishes to commit hara-kiri and is willing to take other people down with him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fairweather: This man has demeaned and soiled this place, but does not have the courage to stand up in this house, and make the charges he loves to make when the press sit around his office. He will not do it now because he knows there are procedures which he cannot bear to have brought into play against him. That is why he will not get up. This strange man likes to go about in other places and environments making smears and statements; that is what he likes to do and that is why it will be hard to explain in the years that follow what we have been doing in these days.

[Translation]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker stated emphatically that the Minister of Justice is not brave enough to rise and name names. Now, they are not giving any names themselves, but they insist that names be given. If no member is brave enough to name names in the house, some people outside the house have that courage.

In the *Toronto Star* of this afternoon—

[English]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of order. My question of order is that the member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) has indicated his intention to read into the record

[Mr. Fairweather.]

a story which has appeared in the *Toronto Star*, and perhaps in other press media in this country, stating facts which, unless they are read into the record of this place whereby immunity is gained, may constitute slander or libel against certain individuals. That is the first point.

Second, if the member for Villeneuve persists in reading into the record the story which he indicated it is his intention to read, from the *Toronto Star*, he must not only take the full consequences as a member for doing so but he must take the consequences that the minister has assumed in making these charges. I have seen the story, as have other hon. members. If he reads it, he is making precisely the charges, the minister made, but more specifically than he had the courage to do.

I therefore suggest to Your Honour that it is completely out of order for the hon. member to read into the record this *Toronto Star* story without adopting the views and opinions contained in the story, and taking the full consequences for his actions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Translation]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) spends his time in the house reading press releases, press reports which may at times incriminate one or several persons.

Under the circumstances, I am not the one who wrote this item in the *Toronto Star*, but I am reading the report published today in that paper. I am not saying that the report is truthful but that someone outside the house has the courage to name names, that someone outside the house phoned to Munich this afternoon and talked to Miss Gerda Munsinger.

[English]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member now is disclosing his purpose. He says he is going to read, from some article in the *Toronto Star*, the names of certain persons who allegedly are involved in some of these circumstances. There are some questions which immediately come to mind. What truth is there in the article? Are we assured of that by the hon. member? Is this a method of protecting the Minister of Justice who will not make the disclosure in the house? Is this a roundabout method of making further unsubstantiated charges? This all, sir, is a travesty of the