

the deputy commissioner, it is not true; and he chooses to condemn a witness who gives evidence, whether hearsay or not, by reference to what the Prime Minister would have said if he had said it.

The unusual circumstances arise because tomorrow the commissioner is to give evidence. And what a predicament he is in if he says "I told the commissioner this—" after the statement made by the one who is in charge of the mounted police with the authority I have set out. It is the gross irregularity which has taken place here.

Mr. McIlraith: On a point of order, there is surely some sense of responsibility in this house—

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am asking for that on the part of the government.

Mr. McIlraith: And I am asking for it, too. I have some duties in this house just as the right hon. gentleman has. He has no right to abuse the rules of this house and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to see that the provisions of standing order 26(3) are observed. Until the right hon. gentleman observes that standing order and hands his written statement to you, Mr. Speaker, and you have acted on it as set out in that paragraph I ask that the right hon. gentleman remain in his seat.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If there were not so many interruptions I would have come to the resolution long ago.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is these irresponsible interventions that interfere.

Therefore I ask leave to move the adjournment of this house in accordance with standing order No. 26 in order to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely the unprecedented and unjustified action of the Minister of Justice in issuing through the office of the Prime Minister a statement which appeared in the press on February 27, 1965, contradicting evidence given before the Dorion commission, thus refuting the truthfulness of the deputy commissioner and subjecting the commissioner to gross intimidation in respect of the evidence—and I say, in that connection, in respect of the evidence he is going to give, challenged as it has been in advance—and bringing into disrepute the integrity of the members of the R.C.M.P. and the force itself which operates under the direction of the minister.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Before the matter of urgency is discussed it is my responsibility to rise and, as calmly as possible, to point out to the house the lack of justice the former—and I insist on the word "former"—prime minister of Canada (Mr. Diefenbaker) just displayed in making the most dreadful charges involving that the Minister of Justice of this country has practically charged of perjury the deputy commissioner of the R.C.M.P. because after all, that is the purport of what he just said.

Mr. Speaker, not only do I accept, but I have never denied the complete good faith of Deputy Commissioner Lemieux when he made, before the Dorion commission, a statement that I never questioned, namely that he was under the impression that I had informed the Prime Minister of the probable questioning of Mr. Rouleau and that consequently the Prime Minister should have informed him that such an examination might occur.

I never questioned the good faith of Deputy Commissioner Lemieux, and I continue to believe that he was justified in having such an impression, but what I said was that his impression was not in accordance with the facts or with reality, and I think that today the Leader of the Opposition must bear the terrible responsibility of the unfair words he stated a moment ago. From the very first years that I practised the law profession, I always admired the R.C.M.P. with whom I have been working ever since and I shall never tolerate that any member of the house, no matter his function or position, should accuse me of having questioned for one moment the good faith or the fair-mindedness of a member of the R.C.M.P., under oath or not.

Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I thought—

Mr. Pickersgill: This is a question of privilege.

Mr. Favreau: I am speaking to a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Diefenbaker: As long as it is understood that if the hon. gentleman is going to argue the facts I shall also be able to do so. I will be very glad to do that, but the minister objected to my so doing. The question of urgency, as I was told by the hon. President of the Privy Council, is the important thing. The