the betterment of the administration of justice. The only purpose they had in mind was to decide that the time had arrived when it was politically advantageous to bring this case to light. We should never have heard of the meeting and it would have been lost to posterity had it not been for the fact that an examination of the records brought it to light.

As the commissioner of the R.C.M.P related his story before the inquiry, he was asked whether this information regarding the Munsinger case had ever been brought to the attention of Mr. Chevrier when he was minister of justice, and the answer was in the negative. The same question was asked in relation to the present President of the Privy Council and the commissioner stated that the information was given to him on December 1, 1964.

It was on that date that the assistant commissioner, Mr. Kelly, according to the commissioner, was told by the Prime Minister, to discuss this case with the President of the Privy Council. We now begin to see the course. I should like to read what actually took place as reported in the press.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Starr: This is what was reported in the press.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Does the Prime Minister say what has been reported by the press is not relevant? These reports relate to an open hearing, not a secret one. This is the one thing that came out into the open that would have been concealed if the attempts had been successful to establish secrecy in this commission. In that event the Canadian people would have received this story haphazardly. There is no false notion in this nation in respect of the political implications. The press of this nation is appalled that anyone occupying a high position such as the Prime Minister should be in the invidious position in which he now finds himself.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman would—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Just a minute. The Prime Minister said he did not want to be interrupted and I do not—

Mr. Pickersgill: I rise on a point of order.

An hon. Member: There is no point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister is rising on a point of order.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is a very simple one. The right hon. gentleman is purporting to read from a document and I think the house is entitled to know what the document is. I believe the right hon. gentleman said it was a press report. We should, therefore, know precisely what newspaper it is so that it will be identified and can be referred to by hon. members for the purposes of this debate which ends at 8.15 p.m. today. I hope the right hon. gentleman will give us that information because, and this is part of my point of order, sir, the right hon. gentleman must vouch for the absolute accuracy of the press report compared with what may be shown by a transcript of the evidence.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: Does the right hon. gentleman vouch for the accuracy of the report to which he refers?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps there is a point of order in respect of the first question raised by the minister. However, I believe the second question is an inquiry rather than a point of order.

An hon. Member: The Leader of the Opposition has found himself a sucker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Villeneuve wishes to speak to the point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition is about to read a press report on the subject we are now discussing or on what happened during the inquiry.

Not so long ago, when it was discovered that Gerda Munsinger was actually alive in West Germany, Your Honour prevented me from reading certain newspaper articles, one of which was from the Toronto *Star*. It seems to me that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) does not have more privileges than any other member when it comes to quoting a newpaper article.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I intended to read from press reports, and I have never heard this practice challenged before. Certainly we have a revised version of things from the Prime Minister today who tried to explain the unexplainable. The Minister of Transport asked me to identify what I intended to read.