

Conduct of Justice Minister

the newspaper reports that the person who gave that impression to the deputy commissioner was R.C.M.P. Commissioner G. B. McClellan.

If it is true—and we in the house can only go by newspaper reports; we have not access to the transcript of evidence before the Dorion commission—that the deputy commissioner has stated on the stand, under oath, that his information came from the commissioner, this takes on very serious overtones; because, Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada have a right to know just what are the facts here. Is Deputy Commissioner Lemieux mistaken about the impression which he alleges he gained from the commissioner, G. B. McClellan?

The commissioner himself will be questioned with regard to this matter. By making a public statement through the Prime Minister's office, the Minister of Justice has already put the commissioner in a very difficult position. He must either say that the deputy commissioner was entirely erroneous in the impression he gained, or he must make a statement which will be in direct conflict with his superior, the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Nielsen: In which case he resigns.

Mr. Douglas: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that by issuing the statement last Friday the Minister of Justice has now opened up this whole question for discussion. The understanding in this house has been, in recent days, that the entire question before the Dorion commission was sub judice, but by intruding himself into a discussion and making a public statement contradicting a witness who has just given evidence under oath, surely—

An hon. Member: It was not evidence.

Mr. Pearson: It was inadmissible evidence.

Mr. Nielsen: It was the minister's evidence.

Mr. Douglas: It is said, Mr. Speaker, that it was not evidence, but the judge refused to rule it out. He said it was hearsay evidence. It will become evidence when the commissioner himself appears before the commission tomorrow and on subsequent days. Therefore the commissioner is forestalled, before he even appears as a witness, by the statement made by the Minister of Justice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: I say, Mr. Speaker, that this question is urgent because never in my experience—nor, I am sure, in anyone else's experience—has a minister of justice made a

statement through the prime minister's office which calls in question a statement made by the deputy commissioner and already intimidates the commissioner who is to appear on the stand in the next few days.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: I think it is most imperative that this matter be cleared up—

An hon. Member: He should resign.

Mr. Douglas:—because either the deputy commissioner is wrong as to the impression he gained from the commissioner or the Minister of Justice is wrong when he makes the statement that the Prime Minister knew nothing about the involvement of his parliamentary secretary, and that the Prime Minister was not told by the Minister of Justice, either in the discussions of September 2, 1964 or November 22, 1964, about the activities of his parliamentary secretary. It seems to me that the Canadian people and this house have a right to have this matter clarified, and it can only be clarified if Your Honour allows the urgency of debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, very briefly I would like to make a few comments on the motion of the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) to the effect that it is urgent for the house to adjourn in order to discuss some statements that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) is said to have made over the week end with respect to the Dorion commission.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this situation is rather delicate. If I go back a few months at the time when we set up that inquiry, I remember that in this house the official opposition as well as the other parties asked that the terms of reference of this inquiry commission be wide enough to cover the whole matter involved.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Prime Minister to extend the terms of reference of the Dorion commission, so that it may extend its inquiry not only to the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition, but to the information sources which may have existed since the beginning of this inquiry and even before, that is on the origin of the information which may have been given to some members of the House of Commons by unknown sources. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that complete light be thrown on this matter.

Personally, as a member from the province of Quebec, I wish that the most complete