

*Conduct of Justice Minister*

light be thrown on this matter, and I do not want in any way to be accused of supporting any measure which would prevent light from being thrown on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that all of us, including the ministers and the leader of the official opposition, should in all decency avoid comments on that matter until the Dorion commission has completed its inquiry. I am sure that when the investigation is over and the commission's report has been tabled, the government will give the house full opportunity to discuss the report and will allow every member to express his views on the whole question. Then and only then should we have the right to discuss the inquiry if it is felt that a particular point has not been sufficiently examined or should be gone into more thoroughly.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that you should decide against the adjournment motion introduced by the Leader of the Opposition. That issue is not yet debated publicly and it is not here that we will learn anything new.

An official commission of inquiry has been set up and I would ask the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister to take the necessary steps to have the terms of reference of the Dorion commission broadened so as to include what I have pointed out.

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve):** Mr. Speaker, in a few moments you will have to decide whether the adjournment motion of the Leader of the Opposition is valid or not.

In my opinion this whole thing is due to the fact that statements are being made here and there after evidence is given by certain people before the Dorion commission. We notice an obvious contradiction between what we read about that and the statements made, in this case by the Minister of Justice. In such circumstances it seems to me the Minister of Justice should observe the most complete silence until we know exactly what the Dorion inquiry will bring out. Instead, as the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam pointed out a while ago, statements are being made which might exert some kind of influence on evidence to be given tomorrow, the day after or later on. If the Minister of Justice or any other minister of the crown takes the liberty of making statements, even when the Dorion inquiry is duly sitting, it is the duty of parliament to discuss that matter to find out exactly what prompted those statements from a minister of the crown, that is the Minister of Justice.

[Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John).]

Now, this storm is certainly due to the Minister of Justice who made statements.

But the Minister of Justice or the Prime Minister should know that all the Leader of the Opposition is looking for is to corner them not so much to inform public opinion but to improve his own image which is losing some of its brightness across Canada. It is just a political game.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should wait until the Dorion commission submits its report on the activities, the true or alleged scandals which might have occurred recently in Canada, and in our province in particular.

It seems to me that when this report is before the house then will it be the proper time to discuss all the matters it deals with, and even whether or not the Prime Minister had informed the hon. member for Dollard (Mr. Rouleau) or whether he has had any communications with either one, in a word, we can always discuss the whole matter at that time. Otherwise, if we discuss the matter today and get back to it later this will entail a loss of time for the House of Commons as well as a loss of money for the Canadian taxpayers.

In my opinion, we should wait for the report of the Dorion commission to consider all those questions and to see to what extent a minister, or the government, has misled us in regard to the activities of certain officials or of the administration in general.

[Text]

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any others who wish to assist the Chair?

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I think the house is entitled to know what standard of propriety would motivate the Minister of Justice in trying to get in touch with the inquiry commissioner at the very moment when his own conduct is under consideration by that commissioner.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** And is about to give evidence.

**Mr. Fairweather:** Surely if the commissioner, who by statute is responsible to the minister—it is a statutory matter—has had his position prejudiced by this *ex gratia* statement of the Minister of Justice, the deputy commissioner has no alternative but to resign. I think the house is entitled to a full debate on this question immediately.

**Mr. Speaker:** If there are no other members who wish to contribute, what the Speaker has to decide at the moment is whether there is here a *prima facie* case of