

That order in council confers absolute powers upon an individual, and thereby constitutes that person not only an investigator, but also the judge of the things in respect of which he is investigator. Every recourse to the courts is denied. And all opportunity of any one securing justice has been prevented by the addition of section 8.

I found out about this order in council early in October, and a question was passed as an order for return on October 10 the purport of which was as follows: How many orders in council have been passed since May 6, 1945, that deny the individual the right of recourse to the courts? I did not get an answer. Investigation was made with a view to ascertaining—

Mr. HOWE: May I ask the hon. member what individual has been denied access to the courts.

Mr. HOMUTH: Everybody.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Everybody within its purview.

Mr. HOWE: No one has been charged with anything.

Mr. HOMUTH: Oh, don't be facetious.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): The minister needs counsel.

Mr. HOMUTH: He needs common sense.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The Tory party needs one.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not wish to enter into any controversy in this matter. The minister asks this question. Where was anyone denied recourse to the courts? Well, I have read the section, and I would ask him to read any section which allows access to the courts.

Mr. HOWE: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The minister will be answering in a minute. His best answers at the present time are interruptions.

After I had ascertained that there had been some order in council in this connection, I asked a question on October 3, and the order in council was not brought down for three weeks. However, about October 25 the *Financial Post* ascertained the circumstances connected with this order in council. During the period I was endeavouring to secure this order in council, Mr. Thompson, of the Department of Munitions and Supply, was communicated with. He was asked whether

or not he would produce this order in council. My information is that his answer was that the order in council was in his drawer. Later on, he said that he would send a copy of the order in council to the leader of the opposition, by secret messenger, but that its contents were not to be revealed, and that it was to be returned. It was to be returned after examination—

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Chairman, this is something unusual. Did someone apply to an official in my department for a document? That, it seems to me, is what is referred to. Which Mr. Thompson?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: He is the man in charge.

Mr. HOWE: It is a bit of sculduggery, I should think.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Now, Mr. Chairman, I always try to exhibit good manners in parliament and I would ask the minister to follow a like course. The minister says he does not know who Mr. Thompson is. He was the man who had custody of the order in council which takes away the rights of individuals in this country. Finally it was produced on October 25.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must take the minister's word.

Mr. HOMUTH: No, you don't—no.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I accept the minister's word, and it indicates that this order in council was passed without his knowledge or consent.

Mr. HOWE: Let us have no nonsense. There are several people named Thompson in my department. I asked which Thompson it was. I certainly said I did not know which man named Thompson. I asked who would inquire from an official of my department for an official government document.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I did not make the inquiry. That was made by someone else.

Mr. HOWE: Who did?

Mr. McILRAITH: How do you know it was made?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Probably if you communicate with Mr. Thompson, the man who had the order in council in his possession, he should know something about it, and would be able to tell you what the situation is. It was the *Financial Post* that brought it to