

*Morality in Government*

permission of the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) to ask a question. The occupant of the chair at that time did not recognize me. After this right was refused, there were five members who rose on questions of privilege or points of order. They were all recognized. I was deprived of my right, without any explanation from the Chair. I believe I have the right to put a question to the hon. member for Lapointe if he would allow me to do so. On this score I think my right as an individual member of parliament has not been recognized. I hope that I can now put the question, if the hon. member for Lapointe allows me to do so and if the Chair would recognize this right.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Chair will be pleased to recognize the right of the hon. member to put a question if the hon. member for Lapointe is willing to accept it.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Grégoire:** Mr. Speaker, as I do not have too much time left, I would ask the hon. member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade) to wait until I have completed my remarks. I will then be only too glad to answer his questions.

[*English*]

**Mr. Valade:** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I forgot to mention when I stated my question of privilege that the house did not adjourn until seven minutes after six. I rose at one minute before six, but I was refused that right to ask a question.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Grégoire:** When I have completed my remarks, I will be pleased to answer the questions of the hon. member for Sainte-Marie.

Mr. Speaker, in his testimony the R.C.M.P. commissioner made a few statements provoking the ire or the anger of certain members of the opposition. This afternoon the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) made a correction. If we accept his statement, then we will vote against the amendment; on the other hand, if we vote in favour of the amendment, we would be saying that the Prime Minister lied when making his statement.

Mr. Speaker, this is a poor situation, because not only have scandals been raised, but even the Prime Minister's word is being questioned. Of course, we do not have all the facts in this matter. There were witnesses to

the conversation between the Prime Minister and the chief commissioner of the R.C.M.P. The present President of the Privy Council (Mr. Favreau) was there, and so was the secretary of the Privy Council, Mr. Robertson.

● (8:10 p.m.)

Obviously, if we had the opportunity, before the vote, to question those witnesses, we would have a better idea of what may have occurred during that conversation. But the vote will soon be taken and we will not be able to question the other witnesses. We must therefore vote on the amendment without having heard those witnesses.

Mr. Speaker, for the time being, I do not hesitate to say that, even though the Prime Minister is a Liberal, which may be a defect, on the other hand I believe what he said. I think he is an honest man and I do not hesitate to believe what he tells us. Just as I can say to the Leader of the Opposition that I did not doubt his word either. I have always respected him to the extent that, when he rose in this house to make as strong a statement as the Prime Minister made this afternoon, I always took his word for it, as I did in the case of the Prime Minister. Everything is based, as I said this afternoon, on accusations made on both sides. But when one considers who makes the accusations, the value of the argument put forward by the one who moved the amendment yesterday is reduced.

For two or three years now, in the House of Commons, a pretence is made at discussion in order to sully reputations. The opposition blames the government today for doing what it has been doing for three years. For instance, we saw the reputation of the member for Matapédia-Matane (Mr. Tremblay) tarnished without his being even given a chance to justify himself and without his accusers being requested to retract their words.

Those who doubt other people's word are the first to object to light being thrown on accusations made against them.

I remember among other things—and the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) must recall this—that he was once accused himself in this house of making false statements under oath. The hon. member for Yukon was accused of this before and he did not want the truth to come out in this regard; he did not want those who laid the charges to be in a position to prove them. Charges had been made against him that he had made false statements under oath. However, he did not want those who had made such charges to be