

*Administration of Justice*

committee meeting, approved by His Excellency the Governor General, on March 14, 1966, which gives the terms of reference.

On reading it over again, I wonder how anyone could think that the terms are not broad enough.

It is mentioned among other things:

—into all statements by the Minister of Justice—

“into all—”, it is not said into a part of them but “into all”. If there is something broader than the word “all”, meaning comprehensive, well I would like to know what it is.

Further on, the press conference is mentioned in the following words:

—all statements by the Minister of Justice in a press conference on March 10, 1966, which among other things included—

There is reference to what was included, but with no intention of limiting, it is said “among other things”. “Among other things” is thus included in the terms of reference.

And further on, it says:

—statements about involvement—

This term of reference is not restricted, Mr. Speaker. On the contrary, it is made as general as possible: “concerning persons involved in this case”. This wording is very general.

Further on it says:

—as well as circumstances that may have constituted—

As one can see, dates, persons, circumstances are mentioned—

—and into all the relevant circumstances connected therewith—

• (9:50 p.m.)

There again, it is said:

—and into all the relevant circumstances connected therewith, and in particular but without limiting the generality of the foregoing to consider fully all reports submitted to the government or any member of the government of the day and any evidence laid before them in connection therewith and any further evidence elicited by or laid before the Commissioner and to consider such other matters as may appear to the Commissioner to be relevant—

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if there are not enough words in all this to satisfy the official opposition, nothing would satisfy them.

Then, I should say: the order is perhaps too general or too broad for them. The terms of reference are formulated in such general terms that they are afraid.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

On the second page, the following is to be found:

The committee recommends further

1. That the commissioner avail himself of his absolute powers of appreciation—

This is not a relative power, Mr. Speaker, but an absolute power.

And, continuing:

—as to the procedure—

Mr. Speaker, is there a more general, a wider term than absolute? To my mind, there is none. Even absolute cannot exist on this earth, as is well known.

The order in council continues:

That the commissioner be authorized to exert all powers provided under section 11 of the Inquiries Act;

Once again the words “all powers” are used. This is a general, a wide term, and efforts are being made to restrict it, although it is provided for in an order in council passed March 14, 1966, today. And they refuse to accept those terms of reference.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to read a quotation which illustrates my thought and shows also that arguments such as mine have already been used. As is shown on page 1878 of the official report of the Debates dated February 28, 1966, the Leader of the Opposition said:

I immediately add that when the government says security procedures might be revealed I accept that explanation, but that does not justify the refusal to call together an inquiry presided over by a judge or judges sitting in camera.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we of the Ralliement créditiste have been asking for since the first day when this question of privilege was studied: a judicial inquiry.

On the same page, in the opposite column, the Leader of the Opposition said:

Who is hiding the facts here?

Today we can ask him the same question: Who is trying to conceal the facts? And that, when a judicial inquiry can determine the true facts and whether we are faced with an assumption or simply facts indicating that someone acted improperly in connection with the security of the state.

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member for Yukon ask the Minister of Justice to set down his charges clearly and substantiate his allegations.

The inquiry will prove that; charges will have to be made at the time of the inquiry. We have always understood that when there