

directors of the bank, concerning which a denial by the same men appeared next day in the newspapers. This man was given a hearing, and a full hearing, with the help of people who were counselling him. Honourable senators, I have had a bit of experience in court myself, and I know what a man does when he wants the truth, and when he is cross-examining. I say that honourable senators opposite were not cross-examining this man in the committee, but were examining him, and when he forgot something they would very innocently say: Have you done this? Is there something else you would like to say? Didn't you do this? They were complementing him in the presentation of his case.

I am glad my friend has raised that point, and I think I have answered it. Now if he will permit me to continue I shall do so, but if he insists that I have misstated anything I am willing to sit down and listen.

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: It was just to get the complete evidence.

Hon. Mr. Choquette: That is my allegation: it was the most complete, most unfair and most unprecedented proceeding ever heard of.

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: Why did you not complete it by calling the Minister of Finance?

Hon. Mr. Choquette: We had a ruling from the chairman that he would admit any evidence of a confidential nature. That is the worst ruling I ever heard in any committee, tribunal or semblance of a tribunal. We gave that man *carte blanche*. We heard not only his own story but we heard it in his own way.

One of the most extraordinary aspects of the extraordinary conduct of the majority in the committee was the attempt in which they were led by Mr. Coyne to give the country the impression that this was a trial in which Mr. Coyne stood charged with actions both before and after May 30, 1961, that amounted to the most serious and flagrant violations of his duties as a governor. What a court indeed! A court without rules of evidence or procedure, other than those adopted by the partisan majority; a jury that acted at the same time as counsel for the accused; the complete absence of an impartial judge; and an indictment in the most ferocious terms by one of the play-acting jurors, of a person not present before their mock court, and on the basis of statements by the so-called accused. What a court and what a trial! All fair-minded persons will agree that this was a hollow mockery indeed

and will be struck by the discrepancy between a real and properly constituted court and the extraordinary body to which I have referred.

But the most extraordinary thing of all is that the leading members of the cast who acted out this spectacle numbered among them some of the greatest, most celebrated, most revered and most skilful members of the legal profession in this country. Fortunate it is indeed that these proceedings and this so-called verdict will not be reported in the same volumes that record the proceedings and the judgments of the Canadian courts of record.

We were told in committee that if this man wanted to he could divulge all the files of the Bank of Canada, if he thought it was in the public interest to do so, or if he felt he had the right to do so, or if he felt he had been aggrieved or hurt. Some of the outstanding lawyers of the country—and there were plenty of them on that committee—acquiesced in and identified themselves with such a principle. Honourable senators, just imagine the door that the acceptance of such a principle would open to any employee who is supposed to be trustworthy and who has taken an oath not to reveal any confidential matters. Its acceptance would mean that any employee, although having taken such an oath, could accumulate files and make copies of documents, which at a certain time could be used almost as blackmail. Such an employee could say: "I feel you have hurt me or you have injured my character. Here is what I have to say against you. On such and such a date you had an interview with Mr. So-and-so, and on another date you received some money from this person or that." It would come down to that kind of blackmail.

I should like to say a few words on the role of a civil servant. And here I think I can give no better definition than the one given by Mr. Pickersgill, in 1953, at Carleton College.

Hon. Mr. Crerar: May I ask my honourable friend a question?

Hon. Mr. Choquette: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Crerar: Does he maintain or is he suggesting that Mr. Coyne was a civil servant?

Hon. Mr. Choquette: Mr. Coyne had taken an oath. We are not going to play on words—

Hon. Mr. Crerar: I am not playing on words.

Hon. Mr. Choquette: I will answer you. Mr. Coyne had pledged himself; he had taken a solemn oath—I need not read it, because we know it almost by heart—not to divulge