

1 To His Excellency,

The Governor General in Council;

5 Report of Judge Roland Millar, a
Commissioner appointed, under part I of the Inquiry
Act, to inquire into and report upon certain complaints
by Maurice Lalonde, M. P., concerning the administration
of Mr. Alphonse Forget, Local Representative of the War-
10 time Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier, Quebec, and
ex officio Tire Rationing Representative of the Rubber
Controller.

15

By Order in Council P.C.7418, dated October
5, 1943, I was appointed a Commissioner, under part I
20 of the Inquiry Act, to inquire into and report upon com-
plaints made by Maurice Lalonde, M. P., that Alphonse
Forget, Local Representative of the Wartime Prices and
Trade Board at Mont-Laurier and ex officio Tire Ration-
ing Representative of the Rubber Controller was, in the
25 matter of the administration of certain wartime regula-
tions, namely, Order C.B. 43 of the Controller of
Supplies, Department of Munitions and Supply, which
Order was made the Order of the Rubber Controller, De-
partment of Munitions and Supply, by action of the
30 Governor in Council, P.C.9995, dated November 5, 1943.

1 and Order No. 005 of the Oil Controller, Department of
Munitions and Supply, as amended, guilty of -

- 5 (a) Undue favouritism toward dealers in or users of
tires or tubes for motor vehicles in connection
the sale or procuring of such tires or tubes;
- (b) failure to report or reporting incorrectly to his
superiors for investigation and such action as
might be appropriate, facts which came to his know-
ledge and which it was his duty to report in connect-
10 ion with the aforesaid regulations;
- (c) participation or complicity in the commission of
offences against the aforesaid regulations.

As authorized by the said Order in Council,
I appointed Francois Caron, Esq., K.C., of the city of
15 Hull, to act as attorney for the Commission, and Aloise
Boudreault, Esq., Prothonotary of the Superior Court at
Mont-Laurier, to act as clerk for the said Commission.

I also engaged the services of Victor Lemire,
Esq., official reporter of the Hull district courts, to
20 act as reporter in the said inquiry.

After interviewing the interested parties, to
wit: Messrs. Francois Caron, Maurice Lalonde, M.P., Al-
phonse Forget and his attorney, Mario Beaudry, regarding
the inquiry in question, it was agreed to begin the in-
25 quiry at Mont-Laurier, Quebec, on November 3, 1943. I
might add here that one hundred and thirty-one (131)
witnesses were heard during this inquiry.

At the first sitting of the Commission at
Mont-Laurier, on November 3, Mr Mario Beaudry, attorney
30 for Alphonse Forget, moved for particulars of the charges

1 or complaints contained in paragraphs "a", "b" and "c" of
the Order in Council. I granted this motion, and ordered
that particulars be furnished.

5 Pursuant to this order, on November 20, 1943,
the following particulars of the charges against Alphonse
Forget were furnished, to wit:

- A -

1. - This favouritism was exercised in favour of
the Laurin Garage;
- 10 2. - It was of common knowledge that it was easier
to obtain tires from the Laurin Garage than
elsewhere;
3. - The intimate, constant and public relations
between Alphonse Forget and the Laurin family
justified such public or common knowledge;
- 15 4. - This favouritism was particularly shown by the
refusal or granting of permits to the follow-
ing persons:

Roger Laurin	Zéphir Chénier
Damien Boileau	Oscar Robitoux
Victor Martin	Jean Taffeur
Gérard Tauson	Dionel Millette
Joseph Rouleau	Aimé Turgeon
Joseph Forget	J. P. Prévost
Omer Beauvais	Aldéa Desloges
Achille Ouellette	James MacLaren
Bruno Millette	G. A. Charbonneau
Théophile Taillon	Georges Grenier
G. Boisé	Léon Fougère
Hector Beaudoin	Lucien Rouleau
William Froufrou	Gustave Sabourin
A. Dunculin	Robert Dion
Hector Beaudoin	Abbe Poinant
Rodolphe Allard	Aimé Prévost

D. D. Ouellette

- 25 5. - Favouritism shown to G. A. Charbonneau, bank
manager;
6. - Favouritism in favour of Roger Laurin;
7. - Favouritism in favour of Gérard Tauson, merchant;
8. - Favouritism in favour of Gustave Sabourin;
- 30 9. - Favouritism shown by inaudible language toward
other garage owners, to wit: William Grenier,
Gaston Forget and J. Rouleau.

1
FAILURE TO REPORT CORRECTLY to his superiors facts to the knowledge of Alphonse Forget and which it was his duty to report;

5 The undersigned attorney prays the Commissioner to grant him a delay of eight days to furnish the particulars requested in this respect.

10 Participation and Complicity in the commission of certain offenses;

1. - Tires supplied by Alphonse Forget to Hervé Bélangier, tailor, without permit, during the summer of 1942, at Mont-Jaurier;
2. - Tires supplied by Alphonse Forget to J. H. Portelance, without permit, during the summer of 1942, at Mont-Jaurier;
- 15 3. - Tires supplied by Alphonse Forget to Wilfrid Talon, without permit, during the summer of 1942, at Mont-Jaurier;
4. - Alphonse Forget granted tires to Gustave Sabourin as farmer, knowing that the latter was an hotel-keeper;
- 20 5. - Alphonse Forget bought from P. E. Forget, without permit, two (2) tires;
6. - Alphonse Forget saw Ben Yaurin putting gasoline in his automobile at 11 o'clock in the evening;
7. - Alphonse Forget authorized the issue of a permit for tires to Gérard Hausen for the delivery of provisions in logging camps, when the said Alphonse Forget knew that this was false and that Gérard Hausen sold only candles, biscuits, tobacco and other similar goods;
- 25 8. - Alphonse Forget granted permits to a great number of persons whose names appear in this report and who declared that no permit had been refused to them, while Alphonse Forget knew by his records that such declarations were false;
- 30

1 The undersigned attorney prays the Commissioner
to reserve him the right to give further particulars
on or before the 30th of November.

5 This request was granted. Pursuant to this
order, on November 30, 1943, the following additional
particulars, under paragraph "a" were added;

Additional Particulars:

- 10 10. - Alphonse Forget granted unjustified permits
to the following persons;

Paul or Léopold Florant	Thomas Potvin
Damas Vaive	Lewis Strong or Strang
Wilfrid Poupart	Albert Jolicoeur
Aloide Laflour	Louis Larue
Eméric Bergeron	Eulide Nadon
Albert Ouellette	Jacob Denis
J. H. Bérard	Misdras Bélanger

- 15 11. - Alphonse Forget granted permits to persons
residing outside of his district, while he
refused such permits to others for the same
reason;

The undersigned attorney abandons paragraph "b"
of the Order in Council on which the present inquiry
is based.

20 Paragraphe "b" of the said Order in Council
being abandoned, there remain but paragraphs "a" and "c"
of the said Order in Council to be considered by the pre-
sent Commission.

PARAGRAPH "a"

25 Undue Favouritism toward dealers in or users
of tires or tubes for motor vehicles in con-
nection with the sale or procuring of such
tires or tubes;

30 The charges against Alphonse Forget, under
paragraph "a" of the said Order in Council, as detailed
in the particulars given on November 20th and 30th last,

1 including the thirty-three (33) charges mentioned in
section 4 of the said particulars, number in all fifty-
five (55), and eight (8) under paragraphe "c", as de-
tailed also in the 1 particulars, forming a total of
5 sixty-three (63) charges altogether.

Of the fifty-five (55) charges under para-
graph "a", sixteen (16) mentioned in section 4 of the
said particulars were abandoned, to wit, those concern-
ing:

10	Benjamin Boileau	Aimé Turgeon
	Joseph Forget	J. P. Prévost
	Omer Beauvais	James MacIaren
	Beno Millette	G. A. Charbonneau
	Hector Beaudoin	Georges Chénier
	Omer Robidoux	Gustave Sabourin
	Jean Lafleur	Robert Dion
	Lionel Pilote	D. D. Ouellette

15 Were also abandoned, the charge mentioned in
section 8 of the said particulars, and the four (4)
charges contained in section 1 of the additional parti-
culars, concerning:

20	Wilfrid Poupart	Aloïse Lafleur
	Albert Ouellette	Nadras Bélanger

making in all twenty-one (21) charges that were abandoned
by the Complainant against Alphonse Forget, leaving still
thirty-four (34) to be examined and considered by this
Commission under this heading.

25

PARAGRAPH "C"

Participation or complicity in the commission
of offences against the said regulations:

Of the eight (8) charges under the above
paragraph of the said Order in Council, as detailed in
30 the particulars, the following four (4) contained in

1 sections 1, 4, 5 and 6 were abandoned, leaving but the
charges mentioned in sections 2, 5, 7 and 8 of the said
particulars to be considered by this Commission under
this latter heading.

5 I will now proceed to deal with the remaining
charges under the said paragraphs "a" and "c" as detailed
in the said particulars:

Re: Favouritism under section 1 of the
particulars.

10 The complainant in this inquiry, Maurice
Lalonde, Esq., M. P., in his testimony before this Com-
mission, at page 259 of the evidence, states in sub-
stance that the remarks he made on the floor of the House
of Commons, as reported in Hansard of July 6, 1943, were
15 the outcome of certain complaints he had received against
Mr. Alphonse Forget, the local representative of the
War-time Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Taurier, and ex
officio tire rationing representative of the Rubber
Controller.

20 Mr. Maurice Lalonde goes on to say that in
the spring of 1942, or in the beginning of the summer of
that year, Mr. Jean Brisebois, tire dealer at Mont-Taurier,
had complained to him to the effect that it looked very
much as if the said Alphonse Forget was using the privi-
25 leges attached to his functions as local tire rationing
representative to favour the garage of Ben Laurin. He
added that in order to ascertain whether there was any
truth in this statement, he had inquired from Mr. William
Grenier, another garage owner of the same place, and, on
30 being answered in the affirmative by the latter, he had

1 gone to his tenant, one Gaston Forget, another garage
owner, who had repeated the same complaint; and that
other persons also had complained to him along the same
lines at the time.

5 In view of this state of affairs, he adds
that he had taken upon himself, on July 22, 1942, to
write a letter to Mr. L. C. Robitaille, Representative
of Prices and Supply of the Wartime Prices and Trade
Board at Montreal, in which he drew the attention of
10 the latter to these complaints, and asked for a thorough
investigation of the same. The letter, produced as
Exhibit E-19, reads as follows:

Ottawa, 23 juillet 1942

15 M. C. A. Robitaille,
Contrôleur des Prix en Temps de Guerre,
Edifice Alford,
Montréal, Qué.

Cher monsieur,

Mon devoir est de vous mettre au courant d'une
situation équivoque qui existe au sujet de la vente
des pneus à Mont-Laurier et qui relève de votre
succursale à cet endroit.

20 J'ai reçu des plaintes de messieurs Gaston For-
get, garagiste, à l'effet que le gérant local, M.
Alphonse Forget, se rendrait coupable de favoritisme
dans l'octroi des permis pour la vente de pneus.

25 Je suis aussi informé que M. William Gauthier
et Melle Vandenberg ont formulé de semblables
plaintes à M. Gaston Forget. Ces plaintes sont di-
rigées contre M. Yvan Laurin, garagiste de Mont-
Laurier, représentant à cet endroit de la compagnie
Firestone.

Je crois donc qu'une enquête sérieuse s'impose,
et que vous devriez envoyer à Mont-Laurier un agent
spécial pour faire l'inventaire des permis de vente
de pneus ainsi que l'inventaire du stock du garage
Laurin.

30 inutile d'ajouter que j'exige que la présente
lettre soit tenue strictement confidentielle, car

1 elle n'est dictée que dans le but de corriger une situation qui menace de s'aggraver, et qui serait au détriment du Contrôle des Prix en Temps de Guerre et de la population du comté Labelle.

5 Je ne voudrais pas que le gérant du bureau de Mont-Laurier soit ennuyé s'il n'y a eu aucune faute de sa part, mais je tiens à ce que tout favoritisme politique ou autre disparaisse de l'administration du contrôle des prix à Mont-Laurier, et qu'une enquête sérieuse soit conduite pour savoir si les plaintes que je vous communique sont bien fondées.

Votre bien dévoué,
Maurice Lalonde,
M. P. Labelle.

10 A few days alter, on the 31st of July, he received a letter from Mr. L. C. Robitaille, in answer to his own, stating that the result of an inquiry he had made on the subject in question, had clearly shown that the administration in the distribution of tire permits
15 by the office of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier was beyond reproach; that after having had a complete examination made of all the tire permits issued, there were none that had been issued to consumers who were not eligible, and none had been refused without
20 a valid reason. - Mr. Robitaille's letter, produced as Exhibit E-20, reads as follows:

Montréal, 31 juillet 1946

Cher monsieur Lalonde,

25 J'ai bien reçu votre lettre confidentielle du 23 juillet.

Je désire vous faire part que le résultat de l'enquête que j'ai faite sur le sujet que vous m'avez rapporté démontre clairement que notre bureau de Mont-Laurier n'a aucun reproche à recevoir pour son administration dans la distribution des permis des pneus.

30 J'ai fait faire la vérification complète de tous les permis émis jusqu'à date. Aucun d'eux n'a été accordé à des personnes qui n'auraient pas dû en avoir. J'ai aussi fait examiner toutes les

1 applications, et aucune d'elles n'a été refusée sans raison valable.

5 Je réalise que la raison du mécontentement chez vous est plutôt due au fait que certains garagistes ne semblent pas avoir eu pouvoir se procurer les pneus nécessaires pour répondre à la demande. Vous apprécierez sans doute que cet état de choses est tout à fait en dehors de notre contrôle puisque l'approvisionnement de ces garagistes dépend entièrement des relations d'affaires et de crédit avec leurs fournisseurs respectifs.

10 Permettez-moi de vous exprimer notre appréciation pour l'intérêt que vous nous témoignez et veuillez croire que votre collaboration, lorsque accordée à notre représentant local et à son personnel, sera de nature à aider et corriger certaines mauvaises impressions qui semblent exister sans justification.

Bien à vous,
L. C. Robitaille,
Représentant des Prix et
Approvisionnements.

15 Mr. Lalonde adds that as complaints of the same nature kept coming to him, and the situation kept growing worse after the receipt of Mr. Robitaille's letter, he undertook to make a personal inquiry of his own, and forwarded the results thereof to the proper authorities of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Ottawa.

20

Under the circumstances, the attorney for the Commission, François Caron, Esq., K.C., thought it advisable to bring before the Commission the following garage owners and tire dealers of Mont-Laurier, to wit; Messrs. 25 William Grenier, Jean Brisebois, Gaston Forget, Emile Vanohosteing, including Yvan Laurin, manager of the Ben Laurin Garage, known also as the Ford Garage.

30 WILLIAM GRENIER, at page 16 of the evidence, says in substance that he had complained about favouritism being

1 shown since the tire rationing had come into force in
1948, and that his reason for so doing was the decrease
in his sales and the fact that his clients were saying
that it was easier to get tires at the Ben Laurin Garage
5 than his own.

Being asked to name the clients who had made such
remarks, he mentioned one Ferdinand Lamarche and Ernest
Martin. He also states, at page 22, that he had to com-
plain about Mr. Forget for having called him "un écoeurant",
10 which, in English, is the equivalent of "rotten stinker";
and that moreover Alphonse Forget had accused him of steal-
ing anti-freeze in his truck while it was in his garage.
Further on, he adds that Alphonse Forget, on a certain
occasion, had said that he, William Grenier, had no tact
15 and that he was nothing else but a farmer (habitant) and
that he had better be very careful when preparing his
applications in the future, as they would be refused.

JEAN BRISEBOIS, dealer in tires, gasoline and
other automobile accessories, was evasive in his answers,
20 and could be considered as an hostile witness.

He first stated he had no complaint whatever
against Alphonse Forget, but it was proved that he had
complained about Forget to both Mr. Maurice Lalonde, M.P.,
and to Constable J. E. Bourdeau of the Royal Canadian
25 Mounted Police, when the latter had made an investigation
in the matter, and that he had told them that his clients
preferred going to Ben Laurin's Garage because Alphonse
Forget favoured this garage.

GASTON FORGET, another garage owner of Mont-
30 Laurier, states that he had many difficulties with Alphonse

1 Forget concerning tires of his clients; Aimé Prévost,
Idéric Desloges and Lucien Rouleau; that several of
his demands for permits were not acted upon; that he had
lost, as a client, Gédéon Rouleau, who had told him that
5 it was easier to get tires elsewhere; that it was being
said in Mont-Laurier that it was easier to get tires at
Ben Laurin's Garage than elsewhere.

He adds that for this reason his sales of tires
decreased to such an extent that he got tired of making
10 applications for permits and would tell his clients to
go to Ben Laurin's Garage to get their permits for tires.

ERICK VANDERSTEELE, garage owner of Mont-Laurier,
struck me as a witness who did not want to testify in
this matter. He admitted however that he had never had
15 any difficulty with Mr. Alphonse Forget, had no com-
plaint whatever to make against him, and had never made
any.

By comparison, however, his sales of tires in
1940, which amounted to \$2,349.28, and those of 1941,
20 which totalled \$2,612.88, with his sales of 1942, which
only amounted to \$1,177.60, it appears that, like the
other garages, his sales decreased considerably in 1942.

I might add here that all the garage owners and
tire dealers of Mont-Laurier, with the exception of Yvan
25 Laurin, admitted that their business had decreased con-
siderably starting May 15, 1942, when tire rationing came
into force, until December 31, 1942.

YVAN LAURIN, manager of the Laurin Garage, known
also as the Ford Garage, of Mont-Laurier, was also heard.
30 This witness is the son of Ben Laurin, owner of the said
garage.

1 He stated that his sales of tires had increased considerably since the rationing of tires had come into force on May 15, 1942, but denied that this was due to any favouritism.

5 The following figures and information concerning the tire business of the Ben Laurin Garage were then given by him to the present Commission, to wit:

From October 31, 1939, to October 30, 1940, purchases of tires by the Laurin Garage amounted to.....\$ 1,734.68

10 In 1941, purchases of tires by the same garage amounted to.....\$ 2,831.49

From January 1 to May 15, 1942, (date of the tire rationing) purchases of tires by the same garage amounted to.....\$ 1,391.72

And, from May 15 to December 31, 1942, purchases of tires by the same garage amounted to.....\$10,083.72

15 And from January 1, 1942, to September 30, 1943, date of the last purchase of tires by the same garage before the present inquiry began, the purchases were....\$10,722.09

It might be remarked here that these figures represent only the purchase price of the tires sold by the said Laurin Garage during the time mentioned, so that, in order to reach the amount of the sales of tires by the same garage during the same period of time, one must add twenty (20) per cent to these amounts, which represents the approximate profit made on these purchases according to the admission of the witness.

20 The figures given by Mr. Yvan Laurin clearly establish an enormous increase in the tire business of the Ben Laurin Garage from May 15th, (date of the coming into force of tire rationing) until October, 1943, over and above the preceding years of 1940 and 1941, and if we add

30

1 to these figures 20 per cent for profit, the said increase soars to about six hundred (600) per cent.

Mr. Ivan Laurin explains this extraordinary increase by telling us that as soon as tire rationing was
5 established, on May 15, 1942, he got busy and went after the business; that he advertised his garage in the local newspapers; that he interviewed the representatives of important companies doing business in the district, such as the International Paper Company of Maniwaki, and the
10 Abitibi Bus Line Company, who were purchasing their tires in Ottawa or elsewhere, and induced them to place their orders for tires with his garage, which they did, at least for a number of them.

These explanations by Mr. Laurin, the manager of
15 the Ben Laurin Garage, fail, however, to account for all the increase of his tire business. By taking Mr. Laurin's own figures of the extra sale of tires he made through his said initiative, there still is quite a margin of his increased business that cannot be accounted for
20 just through the normal course of business.

I am satisfied that a part at least of the increase was due to favoritism, especially when we will see
later in this report that it was easier to get tires at Ben Laurin's garage than anywhere else, due to the said
25 Ben Laurin's friendship with Alphonse Forget, the local representative of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier.

1 Re: Rumours that it was easier to get tires
 from the Ben Laurin Garage than elsewhere -
 Section 2 of the particulars;

 No less than fifteen witnesses, including three
5 of the garage owners heard in this Inquiry, testified
 that it was common ~~knowledge~~ talk in Mont-Laurier and in
 the surrounding country that it was easier to get tires
 from Ben Laurin's Garage than from any other.

 Among these fifteen witnesses, I might refer to
10 the following:

 CHARLES DORION, a member of the Quebec Provincial
 Police, who, as such, has to travel a good deal in and
 around Mont-Laurier, says, at page 291 of the evidence,
 that several people were saying that it was easier to get
15 tires from Ben Laurin's Garage than elsewhere. He adds
 that this was being said in the neighbouring towns of
 Ferme-Neuve and Lac-des-Iles.

 GEORGES BOISSY, a member of the police force of
 the Quebec Liquor Commission, testifies along the same
20 lines. (p. 106 of the evidence)

 JOSEPH A. THIBAUT, circulation officer of Mont-
 Laurier, states that the rumour in question was not con-
 fined only to Mont-Laurier, but had extended to the sur-
 rounding villages as well, to wit: to Val Barette and to
25 Lac-des-Ecorces. He adds that he believed these rumours
 to be true, because he had even told a doctor, who needed
 a tire, to go to Laurin's Garage, because he thought he
 could get his tire quicker there than elsewhere. Asked
 if he had heard this rumour mentioned by several people,
30 he answered: "By at least twenty or twenty-five." He

1 adds that both Jean Brisebois and Gaston Forget, garage
owners, had told him they could not sell tires because
they could not get permits. (pp. 386, 387 of the evidence)

5 SERAPHIN PELIERAN, an inspector in the office
of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier, ~~was~~
stated that the rumour was constant and that he had drawn
the attention of Mr. Alphonse Forget to it, and that the
latter had said: "They are only cry-babies and jealous;
let them talk!"

10 In view of these statements by some of the garage
owners of Mont-Laurier and by the other witnesses referred
to, it is clear that it was common knowledge in the dis-
trict that it was easier to get tires at Laurin's Garage
than elsewhere, and that it was the subject of conversa-
15 tions in the hotels, garages, and among truck drivers and
that this was known not only in Mont-Laurier, but in the
surrounding district and in the neighbouring villages
and towns.

20

Re: Favouritism mentioned in Section
4 of the particulars:

This section contains thirty-two (32) charges or
complaints against Mr. Alphonse Forget, but, as sixteen
25 (16) of them were abandoned, there still remains as many
to be considered.

I only intend to deal with the cases in which
the evidence discloses that favouritism was shown to the
Ben Laurin Garage, to the detriment of the others.

30

In all fairness to Alphonse Forget, I must say

1 that in some of the charges under this section, he
defended himself effectively. If he did grant a tire
to a person who was not eligible, or refused one to
another who was eligible, I believe it was due only to
5 an error of judgment on his part. In certain cases, no
reproach can be made to him, because he proved that he
had been told by his superiors to use his own judgment,
and in some other cases was personally instructed by
them to either grant or refuse a permit as the case
10 might be.

To cite one case when Alphonse Forget erred in
refusing to grant a permit, I will refer to the case of
Léon Fournier, or Fournier, who, as a lumber dealer,
was eligible for tires. Alphonse Forget tells us that
15 he refused this application because there was a complaint
before the Court at Mont-Laurier to the effect that Four-
nier was a bootlegger, and, in support, produced Exhibit
I-7. I notice, however, that, annexed to this complaint,
there is a declaration, signed by Judge Donat Lalonde,
20 to the effect that this complaint had been withdrawn
against Fournier. Now, in my opinion, whether the said
charge had been withdrawn or not, I do not think it was
within the attributions of Alphonse Forget or of any
other local representative of the Rubber Controller to
25 pass judgment on those who applied for tire permits,
specially, as in this case, when the party involved had
not even been found guilty of the said offence.

In a few cases, however, under this section 4
30 of the particulars, such as those concerning Victor Martin,

1 Zéphir Chénier, Lucien Rouleau, Aldéric Desloges and
Georges Boissy, it is evident that Alphonse Forget made
it difficult to obtain tire permits, and, in some cases,
refused to grant such permits to persons who applied for
5 them through any other garage than that of Ben Laurin's,
when these same persons knew that they could get them
immediately by applying through the said Laurin Garage.

Let us now examine briefly these particular
cases, beginning with that of Victor Martin:

10 VICTOR MARIN applied for tire permit on Au-
gust 6, 1942, through the garage of Jean Brisebois, and
obtained it on August 27 of the same year, that is,
twenty-one days later; when one A. Dumoulin, who was in
the same category, applied for tires through the Ben
15 Laurin Garage on the 21st of August, 1942, and received
his permit the same day. As a matter of fact, the permit
in this case is dated August 20, that is, one day before
the application therefor; but this was probably due to
a clerical error.

20 ZEPHIR CHENIER's first demand for a permit for
two tires, on June 9, 1942, through Laurin's Garage, was
granted; his second application, through Gaston Forget's
garage, on August 1, 1942, was refused; his third demand
for a permit, on December 19, 1942, through the garage
25 of Gaston Forget, was also refused, and his fourth demand,
through the Laurin Garage, was granted. The above facts
show that Chénier's two demands for permits through the
Laurin Garage were granted, and his two demands for per-
mits through the Gaston Forget Garage were refused. You
30 can also compare this case with that of Achille Ouellette,

1 because both used their automobile for the purpose of
transporting sick people to hospitals, and Achille
Ouellette secured three tires through the Laurin Garage,
although it was proved that he used his automobile prin-
5 cipally in connection with his insurance business.

LUCIEN ROULEAU's first application for a tire
permit, on September 6, 1942, through the Laurin Garage,
was granted; his second application, on September 12,
1942, through the Laurin Garage, was also granted; his
10 third application, through the garage of Gaston Forget
was held in suspense, and subsequently refused on De-
cember 15, 1942; his fourth demand, on October 19, 1942,
through Laurin's Garage, was first granted and subse-
quently suspended, as in the case of his third applica-
15 tion, through the Gaston Forget Garage. - From the above
evidence, it would appear that each time Rouleau applied
for a tire through the Laurin Garage he secured them,
and was refused when he applied elsewhere. I do not con-
sider the explanation given by Alphonse Forget in connec-
20 tion with this case well founded.

ALDERIC DESLOGES's first application for tires
through the Grenier Garage was granted; his second demand,
through the garage of Edile Vanhesteing, was also granted,
but his third application, through the intermediary of
25 the Gaston Forget Garage, was refused on September 30,
1942. On this occasion, Mr. Desloges says he went to see
Alphonse Forget, in connection with this refusal, and the
latter personally conducted him to the Laurin Garage,
where he was immediately granted a permit for tires by
30 the said Alphonse Forget, who completely ignored the

1 application he had already made through the Gaston Forget
Garage. Alphonse Forget, in his evidence, explains
that he wanted to help Desloges out, but the fact that
he personally brought Desloges to the Laurin Garage and
5 ignored Desloges's application through the Gaston Forget
Garage is another proof, in my opinion, that he favoured
the Laurin Garage whenever an opportunity presented
itself to him.

GEORGES BOISSY was an officer of the Quebec
10 Liquor Commission whose duties called him away from
Mont-Laurier on a certain day, before the opening of the
office of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board there. The
evidence is contradictory in this case, but, by what I
could make out from it, Boissy went to Alphonse Forget
15 to obtain a permit for a tube which he required at once.
According to Boissy's evidence, Alphonse Forget told him
to get his tube and that he would give him the permit
later. Boissy then went to Gaston Forget and told him
that he was in urgent need of a tube; that he had seen
20 Alphonse Forget, who had told him he would issue the necessary
permit later. Upon this assurance, Gaston Forget gave
Boissy the tube he required. Subsequently, when Gaston
Forget wanted a permit for the tube in question, Boissy
applied to Alphonse Forget for the same, through
25 Hervé Proulx, who had replaced him at Mont-Laurier.
Hervé Proulx declares that when he applied for the said
permit to Alphonse Forget, the latter had replied: "There
is no hurry, let the little Christer wait" - in speaking
of Gaston Forget. Alphonse Forget denies having had any
30 knowledge of the application by Boissy for a permit, but

1 Hervé Proulx goes on to say that he was present when
Boissy made out his application for this permit in the
garage of Gaston Forget and had gone with Boissy to
Alphonse Forget with it, had not entered the place, but
5 knew that Boissy went to Mr. Forge's place for the
permit in question.

 Whatever way you take this evidence, Alphonse
Forget's conduct in this matter does not seem logical.
If Gaston Forget had sold the tube in question to
10 Georges Boissy without a permit, as it was revealed to
him by Proulx, then it was Alphonse Forget's duty to
get after Gaston Forget (whom he did not like), and to
prosecute him for this infraction to the Wartime Prices
and Trade Board regulations in the matter. On the other
15 hand, if Georges Boissy's story is true that Alphonse
Forget had agreed to give a permit later for the said
tire to Gaston Forget, why does he answer Proulx and
tell him "there is no hurry" for the said permit, and
to let Gaston Forget "suffer a while", in connection
20 with this permit?

 The above mentioned parties and others would
naturally spread in the public that at Ben Laurin's
garage, one would get tires without delay, and that
elsewhere one had to wait to get them, when it was not
25 refused outright; these facts necessarily confirm the
rumour proved by at least fifteen witnesses, that it
was easier to secure tires at Ben Laurin's garage than
at any other garage.

 If we add to these facts the rumour of the
30 friendship between Alphonse Forget and Ben Laurin, it

1 follows naturally that those who required tires would
logically go to Laurin's Garage, where there was every
indication that tires could be supplied easier and in
much less time than elsewhere.

5 These friendly relations, between Alphonse
Forget and Ben Laurin, can be considered as an influence
on the part of Ben Laurin on Alphonse Forget, and this
impression was certainly intensified, at least on two
occasions, when the said Alphonse Forget received the
10 visit of his chief, Mr. L. G. Robitaille, Representative
of Prices and Supply of the Wartime Prices and Trade
Board at Montreal for the Montreal District which inclu-
ded the Mont-Laurier District, and went out on pleasure
trips with him and the said Ben Laurin at the latter's
15 summer residence at Lac-des-Iles, and this to the know-
ledge of everybody in Mont-Laurier.

We can easily imagine what impression this
would cause on the public of that district at a time
when we know that Ben Laurin was the same person about
20 whom all kinds of rumours were going around in Mont-
Laurier that his garage was being favoured by Alphonse
Forget, the local representative of the Wartime Prices
and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier.

25

Re: Favouritism toward G. A. Charbonneau;
Section B of the particulars;

Mr. Charbonneau was the manager of the Banque
Canadienne Nationale at Mont-Laurier, and, as such, is
30 not eligible for tire, but, as two other branches of the

1 bank in nearby towns were under his supervision and the
general manager of the bank at Montreal had given Char-
bonneau a letter to this effect, Alphonse Forget granted
him a permit for tires.

5 Although he had to give the law a wide in-
terpretation, to justify the issue of this permit, I
feel that, in view of all the circumstances, he is not
much to blame, inasmuch as I believe he was in good
faith in this instance.

10

Re: Favouritism toward Roger Laurin; Section
6 of the particulars. (Paragraph "a")

15 Roger Laurin is the son of Ben Laurin, owner
of the garage of the same name. We were told that the
said Roger Laurin sold meats and other alimentary products
on commission, and that he had to deliver these goods to
merchants and store-keepers doing business in the district
20 of Mont-Laurier. As such he was eligible for tires; but,
at a time when the quota for tires was very low - and this
reason was being invoked by Alphonse Forget to refuse tires
to others - the granting of four new tires and four new
tubes, on the same day, by the said Alphonse Forget to
the above party, it certainly had all the appearances of
25 a favour, and I am sure it would be considered in that
light by most truck drivers. Moreover, it is hard to
understand how all four tires and all four tubes on Roger
Laurin's truck could become useless at the same time,

30

1 Re: Favouritism shown toward Gérard Lauzon;
 Section 7 of the particulars, paragraph "a":

Gérard Lauzon is a nephew of Ben Laurin, and keeps a candy and tobacco store in Mont-Laurier.

5 In his first application for a tire permit through the Ben Laurin Garage, he is described only as a merchant, but after the word "merchant", which is typewritten in his application, the word "wholesale" and further on the words "transportation of merchandise to
10 lumber camps", written in ink, were inserted afterwards. Of course, with this additional description, making him a wholesale merchant who delivered meats and other goods to lumber camps, he would be entitled to the three new tires he secured from Alphonse Forget, local representative of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier.
15

 Like the previous case of Roger Laurin, he appears to have secured these three tires when the quota was very low and at a time also when one Hector Beaudoin, who was in the same category, was refused a permit for a
20 tire by Alphonse Forget.

Re: Favouritism shown by insulting language toward other garage owners, to wit: William Grenier, Gaston Forget and Josaphat Rouleau; *(Section 8 of the particulars)*

25 When commenting on the evidence of the said William Grenier and Gaston Forget in this report, I referred to the insulting language used against them both by Alphonse Forget in the presence of other persons. We have seen that he told Police Officer Hervé Proulx, speaking of Gaston Forget "Let the little Christer wait, let
30

1 him suffer," and that he said to William Grenier, in the
presence of several persons, that he was nothing but a
blockhead, a dumbbell, a farmer, etc.

5 It was impossible that the attitude of Alphonse
Forget toward the above garage owners would not become
known in the public.

Josaphat Rouleau states that he was called to
Mr. Alphonse Forget's office one day, and there, was accused
by him of investigating the administration of the Wartime
10 Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier, and that when he
(Rouleau) admitted that he had made inquiries regarding
the case of Aldéric Desloges by asking the latter if it
was true that he had been refused a permit for a tire,
Alphonse Forget had got mad and had used insulting language
15 towards him. At this point, Rouleau appeared reluctant
to say any more, and refused to say what Alphonse Forget
had said, exactly, on that occasion, giving the ordinary
excuse of a reluctant witness that he did not remember the
exact words which Forget had used. Another instance, I
20 am sure, of a witness being afraid to say all he knew.

Alphonse Forget apparently has a quick temper,
but ~~even~~ even so, he should learn to control himself. I
believe that his conduct and the language he used towards
the above mentioned persons even if they incurred his dis-
25 pleasure, were most unbecoming in the public position he
held. He denies using the most objectionable names and
language attributed to him, but I cannot put aside the
testimony of all the witnesses who claim he did.

In contrast to the said Alphonse Forget's con-
30 duct towards William Grenier, Gaston Forget, Josaphat Rou-

1 leau and others, we have the proof of the great friend-
ship which existed between him and Ben Laurin. They were
seen together every day of the week, and sometimes several
times a day; they played cards at each other's place; they
5 made trips together to the United States and elsewhere,
and Alphonse Forget spent practically every week-end at
Ben Laurin's summer cottage at Lac-des-Iles; and, on a
couple of occasions, even Mr. L. C. Robitaille, represent-
ative of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board for the Mont-
10 real District, when in Mont-Laurier, joined Forget and
Laurin in these week-end parties at Ben Laurin's summer
cottage.

All these facts convince me that favouritism
was shown by Alphonse Forget toward Ben Laurin.

15

Re: Granting of permits to persons who were
not eligible - Section 10 of the additional
particulars;

As we have already seen, the following charges
20 concerning Wilfrid Poupert, Alcide Lafleur, Albert Ouellette
and Misdras Bélanger under this section were withdrawn,
leaving the following ten (10) to be considered:

25	Léopold Florant	Lewis Strong
	Damase Vaive	Albert Jolicœur
	Émeric Bergeron	Louis Larue
	J. H. Bérard	Euclide Nadon
	Thomas Potvin	Jacob Denis

After the explanations and reasons given by
Alphonse Forget to this Commission, regarding the above
cases, I feel that no blame can be attached to him for
the granting of tire permits to the above mentioned parties,
30 although I think he had to stretch a point to grant a tire

1 permit to Léopold Florant and to Louis Larue.

Léopold Florant is the mayor of the town of Mont-Laurier, and, as such, is not eligible for tires. Alphonse Forget issued a permit in his favour, but, to
5 do so, suggested that Florant describe himself in his application as fire chief of the said town. At the time, I understand the town already had a fire chief, but Florant declared, in his testimony, that he used his car to attend all the fires which occurred in Mont-Laurier,
10 as well as to visit the waterworks of the said town.

Dr. Larue is a dentist, and, as such, at the time, was eligible only for recapped tires. Mr. Forget granted him a permit for new tires. Dr. Larue is described as a surgeon-dentist, and it was claimed by the attorney
15 for the respondent, Forget, that as a surgeon he was eligible for new tires. I am satisfied that the Wartime Prices and Trade Board regulations did not contemplate this distinction when referring to dentists.

But even in those two cases, however, I feel
20 that Forget is not too much to blame, because he acted in good faith and in what he thought was the best interests of the community.

25 Re: Granting of permits to persons residing outside of the district - Section 11 of the additional particulars;

Under this heading, the following applications for permits were made by the undersigned seven (7) parties, to wit;

30 Joseph Brunet Abbé Walter Proulx
Eugene Gagnon Dr. A. Morrissette
Edgar Moore Bishopric of Amos
The Abitibi Bus Line Co.

1 The respondent, Alphonse Forget, admits that
he did not know, at the beginning, that he could grant
permits to outsiders, and for this reason had refused
the applications of Joseph Brunet and Eugene Gagnon, but
5 he adds that he granted the applications of the five (5)
others, to wit:

10 1o - That of Abbe Walter Proulx, parish priest of
Notre-Dame-du-Laus, after communicating with
the local representative of the Wartime Prices
and Trade Board at Papineauville;

15 2o - That of Dr. Amory Morrisette, of Montreal, be-
cause this doctor was on his way to attend a
patient in the district, when he had two blow-
outs and could not go any further. - Forget
states, however, that before granting this
permit, he got in touch with the Montreal
office and was authorized by them to do so;

20 3o - That of the Bishop of Amos, with a consent and
approval of the local representative of the
Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Amos;

25 4o - That of the Abitibi Bus Line Company, because
this company did business in his territory,
and could, therefore, be considered as belong-
ing as much to Mont-Laurier as well as to any
other district;

30 5o - That of Edgar Moore, because this party was
working with his truck for one Joseph Lafon-
taine, a lumber merchant of Mont-Laurier.

 By the above explanations, it will be seen
that Alphonse Forget was quite in his right in granting
these permits.

 As regards the application of Joseph Brunet
25 and that of Eugene Gagnon, which he refused, he frankly
admits that he did not know that he could have granted
them, and states that he was in good faith and should
not, for these reasons, be held responsible - and I
agree with him.

1 Re: Séraphin Pellerin's Dismissal:

 At this stage, I wish to discuss the incident
of Mr. Pellerin's dismissal, as Inspector of the Wartime
Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier. This incident has
5 its importance, as we will see;

 Pellerin is a resident of Mont-Laurier, and,
in the month of April, 1942, following a successful exam-
ination before the Civil Service Commission, and upon
the recommendation of Mr. Maurice Lalonde, M. P., the
10 member for Labelle, he was appointed Inspector for the
Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier, under
Alphonse Forget, who, as we have seen, was the local re-
presentative.

 From the very beginning, it appears that
15 Séraphin Pellerin and Alphonse Forget did not pull well
together. We have already seen in this report where
Pellerin took upon himself to advise Alphonse Forget about
the rumours circulating in Mont-Laurier and elsewhere to
the effect that favouritism was being shown by him toward
20 the Ben Laurin Garage, to the detriment of the other ga-
rage owners. On the other hand, it appears that Forget
had complained about Pellerin to the Montreal office.
Mr. Louis Raoul Daigneault, Superintendent of the local
offices of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board for the
25 Montreal region, tells us that on his first inspection
visit to Mont-Laurier, in June, 1942, he had reproached
to Pellerin that he was abrupt in his dealings with the
public, and that he had used the expression "fifth column."

 Daigneault, at page 919 of the evidence, tells
30 us also that Alphonse Forget had given him to understand

1 that Pellerin was inclined to give out certain information
that was somewhat of a confidential nature. He also states
that he had forbidden Pellerin to examine the records of
the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier without
5 permission, but this was flatly denied by Pellerin who said
he had only been warned by him to be careful about the in-
formation that came to him through the office.

By reading the evidence of all those concerned
in this matter, it is apparent that, from the very start,
10 Alphonse Forget and the officers of the Montreal office,
including Messrs. Robitaille and Daigneault, were suspicious
of Pellerin, and even thought that he was nothing else but
~~xxxxxx~~ Mr. Maurice Lalonde's political agent, to pry into
the affairs of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Mont-
15 Laurier, and to report back to him whatever confidential
information he could secure.

Alphonse Forget, Robitaille and Daigneault
all frankly admit that they had no direct proof of this.
Mr. Daigneault states, at page 929 of the depositions,
20 that it was merely an "hypothesis" and an "opinion" that
they had.

Matters stood thus when, on November 12, 1942,
while Alphonse Forget was attending a meeting of the local
representatives of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board, at
25 Montreal, Pellerin, on arriving at the office, obtained
from Miss Lucie-Anne Lamarche, secretary of the Mont-Lau-
rier office, the records of the permits, examined them
there, in the office, and, after having taken notes, re-
turned them to Miss Lamarche. Miss Lamarche, on the same
30 day, notified Alphonse Forget by telephone of what had

1 occurred. The officers of the Montreal office, jumping to
the conclusion that Pellerin had taken advantage of the
absence of Forget to secure more information for Mr. La-
londe, and that he had even brought documents to Mr. Mau-
5 rice Lalonde's office at Mont-Laurier, sent him a telegram
the next day to the effect that he was suspended from his
duties.

Pellerin then notified Mr. Lalonde, who was in
Montreal, of what had happened, and arranged to meet him
10 there the next day.

On Monday, the 16th of November, both Pellerin
and Lalonde had an interview with L. G. Robitaille, Repre-
sentative of Prices and Supply of the Wartime Prices and
Trade Board for the Montreal region. Mr. Robitaille in-
15 terviewed them separately. Pellerin states that when he
asked why he had been suspended, Robitaille at once had
said: "You are accused, Mr. Pellerin, of being the political
agent of the member for Labelle, Mr. Lalonde, and you are
also accused of having taken documents from the said office
20 at Mont-Laurier and brought them to Mr. Lalonde's office,
in order to study them together," and then added: "you are
moreover accused of having intimidated Miss Lucie-Anne La-
marche in order to obtain those records from her." (p.255
of the evidence)

25 Pellerin declares that then and there he
immediately denied those charges, which were false, accord-
ing to him, and told Robitaille that if he would call in a
commissioner of the Superior Court, he would give him
immediately an affidavit to this effect.

30 Mr. Maurice Lalonde, M. P., who was next in-

1 interviewed, states that Robitaille, on being asked why he
had dismissed Pellerin, told him that he (Maurice Lalonde,
M.P.) had constituted Pellerin his political agent in the
county of Labelle, and that he was further accused of
5 having come to his office with confidential records of the
Wartime Prises and Trade Board. Mr. Maurice Lalonde im-
mediately denied these charges, and added that the persons
who had reported them had lied. (p.865 of the evidence)

Like Mr. Pellerin, Mr. Lalonde offered to
10 give an affidavit at once refuting these charges to Mr.
Robitaille, but the latter refused, and, upon this refu-
sal, Mr. Lalonde stated to him that, in any case, he would
put the whole matter before the higher authorities; which
he did, by giving Mr. L. T. MacKenzie a confidential résumé
15 of the rumours and charges made against Forget. He says
in the same document that he insisted for an impartial
inquiry of the whole matter, in order to find out if it
was true, and if so, to see that the appropriate measures
be taken to remedy the situation. (p.866 of the evidence)

20 Mr. Robitaille, at page 945 of the depositions,
just says this about his interview with Mr. Pellerin;

25 "When Mr. Pellerin came to my office, it was
after he had been suspended. We had suspended
him immediately when we learned about the in-
cident that had taken place when it was re-
ported to us that he had, without reason, con-
sulted the records, and that he had acted di-
rectly against the precise instructions that
had been given to him by the superintendent
of the local representatives a few weeks pre-
viously."

and let it go at that, without admitting or denying what
Pellerin had said had taken place in his office at the
time.

30 Regarding Mr. Maurice Lalonde, Mr. Robitaille,

1 at page 946 of his deposition, states as follows:

5 "When I arrived at my office, Mr. Lalonde was there, and we had a conversation together to this effect: I explained to Mr. Lalonde what had taken place, and, if I remember well, I even mentioned to Mr. Lalonde that I could not...that it was impossible for me to conceive why Mr. Pellerin, in his duties, thought himself justified, or thought he had the right and thought himself justified to consult records like those; and I even presumed this, I said, I believe, Mr. Lalonde, that the only reason we could see, that we could admit, as inducing Mr. Pellerin to act as he did, when he had been given specific instructions to the contrary, is to secure information from the office for the benefit of somebody,"

10

and he added:

"I even allowed myself to think that this could be for your personal benefit."

15

By this evidence, Robitaille corroborates, to a certain extent at least, the testimony of Pellerin which, as I have already pointed out, was not directly denied by him, and the evidence also of Mr. Maurice Lalonde.

20

Now, whether he realized it or not at the time, Mr. Robitaille, by telling Mr. Lalonde, in so many words, that he was in league with Mr. Pellerin to secure information of a confidential nature, and even to get documents from the Wartime Prices and Trade Board office at Mont-Laurier for his personal benefit, was making serious charges that reflected on Mr. Lalonde's good character and integrity.

25

A few days later, on November 21, 1942, these accusations against Mr. Maurice Lalonde and Mr. Pellerin were repeated in a more direct way by Mr. Robitaille in the following letter addressed by him to Mr. A. R. Hasley, to wit:

30

1 A. R. Hasley, Esq.,
Secretary, Regional Offices Division,
Ottawa.

Re: Mont-Laurier Local Office

Dear Sir,

5 We have your memorandum of November 18th, referring to Mr. Needles' statement with regard to some information about the rubber tire permits issued by Mr. J. A. Forget, our local representative.

May I advise that a complete memorandum on the situation will be submitted to you in the next few days.

10 We have asked Mr. Lalonde, Inspector for the Rubber Controller, to go to that office next Monday and make a complete investigation of rubber tire permits being issued by that office.

15 This is the second time that reports are being made to us in this regard, and, after the first report, we asked Mr. Lalonde, then our Regional Tire Rationing Representative, to rush to Mont-Laurier and to check all transactions since the origin of operations. The result of the first investigation was that not one single exception was found. All permits, accepted or refused, were strictly in line with the regulations.

20 I was anxious to have that report made immediately, as Mr. Forget has been seriously complaining about political interference which came indirectly from the Federal Member of Parliament, Mr. Maurice Lalonde. Mr. Lalonde has also been interfering with our operations in many other fields.

We have been compelled to suspend our Investigator in that office last Friday for reasons that we are now investigating. Mr. Daigneault's report on the situation is as per enclosed copy. We will now wait until we have made a thorough investigation on tire permits to confirm the dismissal of that Investigator.

25 During the last Conference in Montreal, the Investigator made a check of all permits refused and granted to each individual garage. That information has been released to someone unknown to us, but we have reasons to believe that he was acting under the instructions of the Member of Parliament.

30 As you will quite appreciate, our Board will not tolerate that, and this is the reason for the suspension of Mr. Pellerin.

1 The Member of Parliament is naturally going to
try to revenge his protégé by trying to commit Mr.
Forget, our local representative. Mr. Lalonde has
already offered to me to submit a report on the
matter of tire permits, but I told him that if his
report was of the same nature as the one he had al-
ready given me, I was not going to accept it. I
mentioned to him that I would only be interested in
5 reports which would be accompanied with affidavits
so as to make sure that his attitude would be based
on the principle of correcting a false situation
or an injustice, but not merely to satisfy any
other purpose which has no reference with the op-
erations of our Board.

10 My refusal to receive complaints from this
M. P. might offer a reason for the report which was
forwarded, undoubtedly, by him or by his friends to
the Office of the Controller of Supplies.

 It was an established fact that our Invest-
igator in Mont-Laurier was under the impression that
his first boss was the M. P. and not our local re-
presentative or ourselves.

15 The situation is now settled as we have de-
cided to replace him, but your memorandum alters
our decision temporarily, until we are in possession
of a complete report from Mr. Lalonde, copy of which
will be sent to you as soon as received.

L. C. Robitaille

 As mentioned in the above letter, it is true that
the Montreal office of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board
20 had made an investigation of the rubber tire permits of
the Mont-Laurier office. This investigation and another,
made later by Mr. Gaston Girard, were alright in their way,
and were proceeded with in an impartial manner, but, after
all, these investigations were ex parte affairs, and no
25 blame can be attached to the Wartime Prices and Trade Board's
investigators for this, as they had not the power or the
authority to go fully into the merits of the complaints
against Alphonse Forget and the Mont-Laurier office.

30 They were limited, in their investigations, to
the examination of the books in the office of the Wartime

1 Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier, and to whatever
information they could get through discreet questions they
put to persons who were, in many instances, afraid of
getting involved in the matter and to suffer the conse-
5 quences. Both investigators of the Wartime Prices and
Trade Board, Messrs. Alphonse Lalonde and Gaston Girard,
arrived at the conclusion that there was nothing wrong
with the administration of the Mont-Laurier office.

However, an experienced member of the Royal
10 Canadian Mounted Police, in the person of Constable J. M.
Bourdeau, who had also been entrusted by his superiors to
investigate these same complaints against Forget, states,
at paragraph 21, as follows:

15 "It is quite clear, by the above statement, that
there was favouritism shown to the Laurin Garage
on the part of Alphonse Forget. It also bears
out the fact that it was common knowledge that
anyone wanting new tires within a short time,
all that was necessary was to go to the Laurin
Garage and they would get them with but very
little delay, whereas, if they made an application
through other tire dealers in Mont-Laurier, the
reply of A. Forget was always that the quota had
been filled for the month, or, it was very hard
20 to get any and their request was placed in sus-
pense. Most of the people applying for new tires
were truck drivers who were using their trucks
on roads and other work, and needed them as soon
as possible. The result was that they got tired
of not receiving their permit, and finally would
go to the Laurin Garage, and, on doing this, their
permit would be forthcoming with but a very little
delay, and they would obtain their tires."

25 In this same letter of November 21st to Mr.
Hasley, Mr. Robitaille states also that Mr. Maurice Lalonde
was "naturally going to try to revenge his protégé (Mr.
Pellerin) by trying to commit Mr. Forget", his local re-
presentative at Mont-Laurier. He was thereby imputing
30 motives to Mr. Lalonde which were certainly not proved

1 in the present inquiry. I believe, rather, that when Mr. M.
Lalonde, M.P., saw himself accused by Mr. Robitaille of
conspiracy with Pellerin to secure information and even
documents from the office of the Wartime Prices and Trade
5 Board at Mont-Laurier, he was not thinking so much of
taking revenge on anybody, but rather thinking of taking
the necessary steps to clear himself of the accusations
made against his integrity by the Representative of the
Wartime Prices and Trade Board for the region of Montreal,
10 and proved it by demanding to have the whole matter
thrashed out and investigated.

In view of the evidence and of all the cir-
cumstances surrounding this affair, I am of the opinion
that Mr. Pellerin's dismissal from office was unfair and
15 unjustified, because Pellerin had not been given a chance
to defend himself or even to explain his actions, and
because his superiors, as they have admitted, had no
proof to substantiate their suspicions against him.

Furthermore, I believe that Mr. Maurice Lalonde
20 was justified in asking for an investigation, specially
as his own integrity had been questioned and even attacked,
and that it was already known in Mont-Laurier and vicinity
that Pellerin had been accused of taking records from the
office of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier
25 and bringing them to the office of Mr. Lalonde for his own
benefit.

Mr. J. B. Scott, heard as a witness in this
inquiry, (at page 591 of the evidence) testified that it
was already known by several persons in Mont-Laurier that
30 Pellerin had been accused of having brought records from

1 the office of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board in Mont-
Laurier to the office of Mr. Maurice Lalonde, and he adds
that he heard this mentioned by several persons, and that,
as a matter of fact, half of the village of Mont-Laurier
5 was talking about it.

PARAGRAPH "C"

10 I now come to the charges mentioned in the
particulars under paragraph "c" of the said Order in
Council, in which Alphonse Forget is accused of partici-
pation or complicity in the commission of offences against
the aforesaid regulations.

15 As we have already seen, the charges contained
in sections 1, 4, 5 and 6 of the said particulars were
withdrawn, leaving the charges in sections 2, 3, 7 and 8
to be considered by this Commission.

20

Re: Tube procured by Alphonse Forget for J.
Hormisdas Portelance without permit during
the summer of 1942, at Mont-Laurier - Sec-
tion 2 of the said particulars;

25 This is a charge against Alphonse Forget accu-
sing him of participating directly in a violation of the
Wartime Prices and Trade Board regulations.

30 J. Hormisdas Portelance, who is 62 years of
age, has been postmaster of the town of Mont-Laurier since
1937. He states that during the summer of 1942 he had
occasion to go and see the local representative of the

1 Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier in connect-
ion with an inner tube which he required. When asked
what took place exactly regarding this inner tube, Portelance (pp. 229 and 230 of the evidence) says as follows;

5 "In the first place, I arrived at Gaston Forget's,
having an inner tube which could not be used any-
more. Then Gaston Forget told me that I would have
to go to the office of the Wartime Prices and Trade
Board. When I arrived at Alphonse Forget's office,
I said to him; I am in a jam, but I would not like,
because we are friends or because you want to do me
a good turn, that you would do yourself any harm.
Then Mr. Forget asked me where I intended to get a
new tube. I said; My car is at Gaston Forget's.
10 Then he (Alphonse Forget) said; 'Have you any
friends among the doctors?' I said; Everybody is
my friend as much as possible. He said; 'Good,
come back in about an hour, and I'll try and get
an inner tube for you.' In about an hour I re-
turned and Alphonse Forget gave me an inner tube
and I paid him for it, and returned to Gaston For-
get's garage to have it put on my car."

15 He further adds that he got no permit for this tube, and
that Alphonse Forget told him that when a demand for an
inner tube would be made, he would mark two down.

 Gaston Forget, at pages 188, 189 and 190,
corroborates the evidence of Portelance in every respect.
20 When recalled as a witness, the following question was put
to him:

 "Who saw you or telephoned you, regarding the inner
tube of Mr. Portelance?"

to which he answered;

25 "It's Mr. Alphonse Forget who telephoned me and who
asked me if I had a 6.00/16 inner tube. I said yes.
He then said; 'What price are they?' I told him I
had some at \$2.70, \$3.45 and \$4.35. Then he said;
'Wrap one up well, it will expose you less, and
bring it here to my office.' I brought it to him,
and he paid me for it \$2.70, plus 6 cents tax."

 In an affidavit, filed as Exhibit I-1 of the
30 respondent, Gaston Forget adds, regarding this incident,

1 that about fifteen minutes after he had delivered this
inner tube to Alphonse Forget, Portelance came back to
his place of business and handed him the parcel he had
just delivered to the said Alphonse Forget, and, on
5 opening the same had found an inner tube identical to
the one he had given to Alphonse Forget; and that at the
request of Portelance he had put the inner tube in the
spare tire of Portelance's Plymouth car.

I have carefully read over the evidence of
10 both Portelance and Gaston Forget on this inner tube
incident, and, as a matter of fact, I translated the same
for the purpose of this report, and I must say that the
said evidence is clear, to the point and corroborative
of each other in every respect.

15 At page 692 of the depositions, Alphonse
Forget gives us his side of the story thus:

Q. Mr. Alphonse Forget, you are also accused of
giving Mr. J. Hormisdas Portelance, without a
permit, during the summer of 1942, at Mont-
Laurier, an inner tube; will you please give
us all the circumstances surrounding this
affair?

20 A. Yes, sir. As local representative, we have
the right to make cases. Needless to tell you
that the department of enforcement insists that
we should make cases, and all that. Then I
thought it advisable to try Gaston Forget. Then
at noon on a certain day, coming back from dinner,
I met Mr. Portelance on the street, and he told
me that he needed an inner tube and that he could
get one from Gaston Forget. I said, Tell Mr.
Forget to bring it to my office, I'll pay him for
25 it, and then remit it to you. Gaston Forget
brought the tube to my office, I paid him \$2.76,
and immediately after the departure of Mr. For-
get, my inspector came in, but I had no witness
to make a case, and the amount was so small."

It will be remembered that Portelance had told
Alphonse Forget he was in a jam and badly needed an inner
30 tube. In his evidence, Alphonse Forget corroborates For-

1 telance entirely on this point when he says he met Porte-
lance on the street and he told him he needed a tube and
that he could get one at Gaston Forget's; but, later on,
(pp. 788 and 789 of the evidence) when referring to this
5 same incident, Alphonse Forget tries hard to explain that
Portelance never told him he needed a tire, but that he
simply said "I can get a tube from Gaston Forget," which
latter statement would fit better his explanation that
he wanted to make a case.

10 In his evidence, which I have quoted above,
Alphonse Forget states that he did not make a case against
Gaston Forget, because he had no witness to the transaction,
~~but~~ Portelance and Gaston Forget having come to his office
one after the other, and in the absence of his inspector.
15 Cross-examined by Mr. Caron, he repeats that he did not
make a case against Gaston Forget and Portelance because
he had no witness. However, in a declaration signed by
himself at Mont-Laurier, on January 22, 1943, a copy of
which is produced as Exhibit E-23a, Alphonse Forget gives
20 another reason entirely for not proceeding in this manner.
He says that

25 "having learned that Portelance was an inti-
mate friend of Mr. Maurice Lalonde, the member, and
that the garage run by Gaston Forget belonged to
Mr. Maurice Lalonde, the member, I thought it advi-
sable to leave this affair in suspense, in order
not to cause any dispute between myself and the
said member of Parliament."

Cross-examined further on this point, he was
unable to give a plausible explanation of this contradic-
tion, on his part, and, finally, when asked what version
he chose, he answered: "Adopt the one you wish, and we
30 will see which one will prevail." (p. 797 of the evidence)

1 His version of this incident between Portelance,
Gaston Forget and himself may be an ingenious way to try
and get out of a bad situation, but it does not sound plau-
sible, because it is hard to conceive that Alphonse Forget,
5 or any local representative of the Wartime Prices and Trade
Board, would seize such an opportunity to involve a res-
pectable old citizen like Mr. Portelance in an offence
against the Wartime Regulations.

10 If Alphonse Forget's story is true that, when
informed by Mr. Portelance that he needed a tube and could
get one at a certain garage, he profited by this occasion
to send the old gentleman there to get a tube without a
permit in order to make a case against him and the garage
owner in question, I would go so far as to say that by
15 his conduct in this matter, Alphonse Forget placed himself
in the position of an "agent provocateur", and would him-
self be a party to the said infraction. Our law is clear
on this point: "Everyone is a party and guilty of an
offence, who counsels or procures any person to commit an
20 offence." (Criminal Code of Canada, Art. 69). Moreover,
we must not forget that Mr. Portelance was just an ordi-
nary citizen and not an enforcement officer, and, for
this reason, Alphonse Forget could not use him as a common
spotter, without first obtaining his consent.

25 I am satisfied that what happened in this case
was that Alphonse Forget, on learning that Mr. Portelance
needed a tube and knowing he was not eligible, wanted to
do him a favour by helping him to secure one. Mr. Porte-
lance says that he knew Alphonse Forget was doing this for
30 him as a favour, and he accepted it as such. (page 288)

1 Had Alphonse Forget admitted frankly what did
happen on this occasion, instead of trying to make us be-
lieve this would-be story of his about wishing to make a
case, the affair could have been more easily overlooked,
5 but, in the circumstances, I am not so sure now that it
can be excused.

10 Re: Tire procured by Alphonse Forget for Wilfrid
Lalonde without a permit, during the summer of
1942, at Mont-Laurier - Sec. 3 of the particulars;

 This is a charge against Alphonse Forget si-
milar in many respects to that mentioned in the Portelance
affaire just referred to.

15 Wilfrid Lalonde is 67 years of age and has
practised law at Mont-Laurier for many years; he is also
the father of Maurice Lalonde, M.P., the complainant in
this inquiry.

 In his testimony, at page 285 of the deposi-
20 tions, he says:

25 "I needed a spare tire, and Mr. Forget often came,
after dinner, to chat with me on my verandah, and,
on one occasion, I told Mr. Alphonse Forget that
I was going to Montreal and I was afraid of my
spare tire. To this he replied: 'I will get one
for you'. I said: Is it necessary to sign a form
or some kind of application? At the time, I must
admit frankly, I was not conversant with the tire
regulations.

 Q. You did not study these regulations at the uni-
versity?

 A. No, I just studied them when I needed them.
Then, Mr. Forget said: 'It is not necessary to
sign anything, I will pass this sale under a doc-
tor's application.' He added: 'You do business
with Gaston Forget?' I said yes. He knew it any-
way. He said: 'I am going to the office and I
will phone Gaston Forget to sell you a tire.'

30 I said: Alright, thanks very much, this will be

1 a great favour. Half an hour or three quarters of
an hour later, I went to Gaston Forget's garage and
asked Mr. Forget; Did you get a telephone call from
Alphonse Forget? He said yes. I then said; It is
alright for my tire? And Mr. Forget said; 'Yes.'
Then I said; I will take it, and he put it on the
spare wheel. I wanted to keep the old tire, but
he said; 'No, you must leave your old tire.' Then
5 I left him my old tire, he put my spare wheel in
my car and I left. I did not have occasion to use
the spare tire all summer."

Alphonse Forget denies this charge emphatically, as will
appear by his evidence on this incident. At page 763 of
the depositions, he answers as follows:

10 Q. Did you furnish tires to Mr. Wilfrid Lalonde?
A. No, sir.
Q. Will you explain to the Commissioner what took
place?
A. When Mr. Lalonde bought a new tire from Gaston
Forget, I knew nothing about it. A few days
later, in the beginning of the month of May, I
met Mr. Lalonde on the street, he asked me if
he could get tires. I said; You have a right
to get tires, you are eligible for used tires.
15 And that is all that took place between Mr.
Lalonde and myself.
Q. Where did you meet him?
A. On the street. At the time, I lived in the lower
part of the town, and I happened to pass there.
I moved to Mr. Cadieux's about the middle of May.

Now, let us see what Gaston Forget has to say about this
affair. At page 112 of the evidence, he says;

20 Q. What facts do you know about this affair? (mean-
ing the Wilfrid Lalonde Affair)
A. Mr. Lalonde came to my place to get a tire, but
I said; it takes a permit to secure a tire. He
said; 'I will go to see St-Phonse, the repre-
sentative of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board.
Then he went to the office and Mr. Alphonse For-
get telephoned me and he said; 'About the matter
of Mr. Lalonde, put it on and I will fix it.'
25 Q. Who told you that?
A. It's Mr. Forget, on the telephone.
Q. Did Mr. Forget give other explanations, or other
details, in connection with the tire you were to
give Mr. Lalonde?
A. I have already made a declaration, I would like
to examine it to be sure. It is the same thing
I have to say. I sold and delivered a new tire,
size 6.00/13 without a written permit, to Mr.
Wilfrid Lalonde, a lawyer of Mont-Laurier, in
the course of July, 1942, after Mr. Forget had
30 telephoned me that the matter was alright and
that he, Alphonse Forget, would fix it up."

1 As it will be seen, Gaston Forget corroborates
the evidence of Wilfrid Lalonde on the principal facts in
his testimony. Me Mario Beaudry, attorney for the respond-
ent, argued that he saw a contradiction between Gaston
5 Forget and Wilfrid Lalonde; because, according to Wilfrid
Lalonde, he would have seen Alphonse Forget first about
this matter, whereas, by the evidence of Gaston Forget,
it appears that Mr. Lalonde went to his place of business
first, in connection with this transaction. It is true
10 that Gaston Forget and Wilfrid Lalonde do not seem to
agree on this point, but it is only a matter of detail
which can be easily understood, when we know that a period
of about a year and a half had elapsed since these events
took place, but they certainly agree and corroborate each
15 other on the main points, and that is what counts.

Now, to proceed with this incident, we have
the evidence of Maurice Lalonde, who, at page 267 of the
depositions, says:

20 Q. There is a concrete fact concerning your father,
Mr. Lalonde; can you tell us what you know per-
sonally about this matter?

A. Personally, I must say that I saw, in the fall
of 1942, in the trunk of my father's automobile,
a new tire. I asked him where he had secured it.
He said: 'At Gaston Forget's garage.' I said:
You have no right to get tires, you are not eli-
gible. He said: 'Alphonse Forget told me that
I was eligible.' I said: you had better bring
it back. And, a few days later, I saw the tire
in Gaston Forget's garage.

25 Q. Did you talk about this to Alphonse Forget?

A. Yes. I met Alphonse Forget a few days later,
and I said: 'How is it that you allowed a tire
to be sold to my father? He is not eligible.'
He said: 'I will telephone to Gaston and we will
fix this matter up. We will legalize this sale
under a doctor's permit.'

Q. Is that what Alphonse Forget told you?

A. Yes.

30 Mr. Wilfrid Lalonde corroborates his son Mau-
rice, as follows, at page 286 of the depositions;

1 "My son made me a kind of a reproach about this
a year ago. He said: 'You are not eligible.'
I did not really know what was meant by eligible
at the time. He said: 'You have no right, it is
a pleasure car you have.' Then, I said, in that
case, I will telephone Gaston to come and get
his tire, and that is what I did. I told Gaston
Forget; this sale was not regular and illegal,
5 come and get your tire. I did not use it, it
is still on my spare wheel. - Then, one night,
he came and took his tire, and subsequently, he
gave me back the money I had paid him. But I
never got my old tire back.
Q. You never got your old tire?
A. No, it was probably sold by then.

As will be seen, Mr. Alphonse Lalonde, who
10 describes himself as a travelling representative of the
Wartime Prices and Trade Board, had made what he calls
a check-up of tire rationing in Mont-Laurier. This check-
up was accompanied by a statement of each garage owner.
When Mr. Beaudry, attorney for Mr. Alphonse Forget, asked
15 to produce this report, there was an objection by Mr.
Francois Caron, K.C., and I only allowed its production
to show that Alphonse Lalonde had made the said check-up.
I could not allow the contents of the document to be used
as evidence in the present inquiry, as it had been made
20 ex parte and contained no sworn statements. Although it
was understood that the production of the said check-up
would only prove it had been made by Mr. Alphonse Lalonde,
Mr. Mario Beaudry, in his argument, drew my attention to
the following paragraph which appeared therein, under the
25 "Gaston Forget" heading: (p. 892)

" 1 - 600/16 tire and tube given, without permit,
to Mr. Maurice Lalonde to be used on W. Lalonde
car (Maurice's father). Gaston Forget claims Mr.
Maurice Lalonde had said he would fix it up with
the Tire Rationing Officer, Alph. Forget."

Mr. Beaudry went on to say that although the
30 production of Alphonse Lalonde's report was just to show

1 that it had been made, it is no less true that this report
forms part of the record and that it was Mr. Maurice Lalonde, M.P. for the county, that would have obtained this
tire for his father, at the time of Mr. Lalonde's report.

5 My first impression was to ignore entirely
this argument, because, as I have said before, no sworn
statements were contained in the said check-up of tire
rationing, and was made ex parte and without the knowledge
of those who were interested, and without their being able
10 to control any of the said statements.

But, as this could be interpreted against the
complainant, I decided to bring this matter up in the
present report.

In the first place, no mention is made in the
15 said check-up of tire rationing by Mr. Lalonde when, where
or how this statement was made by Gaston Forget. Then,
Gaston Forget, at page 987 of the depositions, denies em-
phatically that he ever made a statement of that kind to
Mr. Alphonse Lalonde, when he was asked if Maurice Lalonde
20 had spoken to him about this affair, he answers thus:

Q. Did Mr. Maurice Lalonde speak to you about this
tire of his father's?

A. Yes, but long afterwards.

Q. What did he say?

A. He said: "My father should not have bought this
tire, he knew he had no right to it."

Q. Did he tell you he would fix this matter up for
his father?

25 A. No, Mr. Lalonde never said that to me.

All the evidence heard in connection with
this incident shows that this statement is entirely un-
founded. Moreover, there always remains the fact that
the said statement is contained in a report whose produc-
30 tion it was understood by all at the time was only to

1 show that it had been made.

As the said statement was not even read in Court, nobody paid any attention to it until the attorney for the respondent mentioned it in his argument.

5 As I said before, there are many points of resemblance between this charge and that in the case of Portelance. Both Mr. Wilfrid Lalonde and Mr. Portelance are old, respectable citizens of Mont-Laurier; both state that they met Mr. Alphonse Forget in his office, while
10 Alphonse Forget says he met them on the street; both say that Alphonse Forget mentioned doctors' permits as a means to cover up these illegal sales of a tube, in the case of Mr. Portelance, and a tire in that of Mr. Wilfrid Lalonde; both their stories are corroborated by Mr. Gaston
15 Forget, owner of the garage through which the sales were made.

I might add here that both Mr. Wilfrid Lalonde and Mr. Portelance ^{did not} appear ^{anxious} to give evidence against Mr. Forget, on account of the ^{fact} ~~fact~~, I suppose, that
20 they knew he had acted as he did towards them in order to do them a favour.

After hearing the evidence of all concerned regarding this charge against Alphonse Forget that he had procured a tire for Wilfrid Lalonde without a permit,
25 after listening to the able addresses of the two attorneys, and afterwards reading over the said evidence and examining it from every angle, I have come to the conclusion that in this instance, as in the Portelance affair, Alphonse Forget had once more acted in violation of the Wartime Prices and
30 Trade Board regulations.

1 It is true that in both the case of Mr. Portelance and that of Mr. Wilfrid Lalonde there is only a tube worth \$2.76 in one case, and a tire in the other, and the said tire was later returned, but it is not so much the value of the objects involved that should be considered in a matter of this kind, but the principle involved.

5 As I have said before, the Canadian people are willingly putting up with all these laws of restriction on account of the war, and, for this reason, I believe that they expect that these regulations, which are harsh enough in themselves, should be administered with the most scrupulous impartiality and justice to all.

15 -----
Re: Alphonse Forget allowing the issue of a tire permit to Gérard Lauzon to deliver provisions in lumber camps when he knew that this was not true, and that Gérard Lauzon sold only candies, biscuits and tobacco. - Sec. 7 of the particulars;

20 I refer to the remarks I made in this case of Gérard Lauzon when commenting on Section 7 of the particulars under paragraph "a" in connection with the same case.

25 -----
Re: Alphonse Forget granting permits to a number of persons whose names appear in section 4 of the particulars under paragraph "a", who declared that they never had any applications refused, when Alphonse Forget knew by his records that these declarations were false. - Section 8 of the particulars: (paragraph "c")

30 Out of about fifteen hundred (1,500) appli-

1 ocations for tire permits in the Mont-Laurier office of
the Wartime Prices and Trade Board, it appears that
thirteen (13) applications contained false declarations.
The falsity of these declarations could have been disco-
5 vered if a search had been made in the records of the
Mont-Laurier office at the time the applications contain-
ing the said declarations were made, but I agree with Mr.
Forget that it was most difficult to make a search in
every case, owing to the time it would take and the work
10 it would entail.

The percentage of the false declarations on
the total number of applications made is less than one
per cent. I consider, under the circumstances, that not
much blame can be attached to Mr. Forget in connection
15 with this charge.

GENERAL REMARKS

20 As we know, the purpose of the present inquiry
was to ascertain if Alphonse Forget, the representative of
the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier, and ex
officio representative of the Rubber Controller, was guilty
of favouritism toward dealers and also if he was guilty of
25 participation or complicity in the commission of offences
against the aforesaid regulations.

It is very difficult to obtain a direct proof
of favouritism in a situation such as the one with which
we were concerned in the present case.

30 This difficulty is increased also by the reti-

1 cence with which some witnesses gave their evidence, as
I had occasion to notice in the present inquiry, but
those witnesses cannot be blamed too much, because one
can readily understand their fear of testifying against
5 the local representative of the Rubber Controller, owing
to their possible future dealings with him.

The proof of favouritism on the part of Al-
phonse Forget towards Ben Laurin in this case emerges
from a number of incidents and facts more or less import-
10 ant which, when grouped together, show convincingly that
Alphonse Forget did favour the garage of Ben Laurin to
the detriment of the other garage owners of Mont-Laurier.

The constant and public friendship of Alphonse
Forget with Ben Laurin, his conduct and insulting language
15 towards some other garage owners, his encouragement to
clients to patronize the Ben Laurin Garage, the delay and
refusal suffered by those who were applying for tires at
other garages, the facility with which tires were obtained
through Laurin's garage, are all facts that prove that
20 Alphonse Forget did favour the garage of Ben Laurin to
the detriment of the other garages.

As regards Alphonse Forget's participation in
the commission of offences against the Wartime Prices and
Trade Board regulations, I may say that the evidence shows
25 Alphonse Forget's participation in two offences against
the Wartime Prices and Trade Board regulations in his
dealings with J. H. Portelance and Wilfrid Lalonde.

It is true that in the Portelance matter there
is only a tube of \$2.76 involved and in the Wilfrid Lalonde
30 case there is only question of a tire which was later re-

1 turned without having been used - and for this reason
some may think these incidents might be overlooked -
but we must not forget that the gravity of these two
offences was enhanced when Alphonse Forget remarked, in
5 both cases, that the irregularity could or would be
covered by entering them on the application of doctors,
who, as we know, are eligible for tires.

In justice to Alphonse Forget, I may say here
that, during the course of this inquiry, no evidence of
10 any kind was made to indicate or to show that a bribe had
been accepted by or even offered to the said Alphonse
Forget in his administration as local representative of
the Wartime Prices and Trade Board ~~and~~ at Mont-Laurier,
and ex officio representative of the Rubber Controller.
15 I am glad to say that his honesty in that respect is
beyond reproach and was never attacked or even questioned.

As I have already said, I am satisfied that
it was his friendship for Ben Laurin and his natural de-
sire, in consequence, to help him, that made Alphonse
20 Forget lean favourably towards him without fully realizing,
perhaps, that he could not do so without being unfair to
the other garage men.

As regards the Portelance and Wilfrid Lalonde
matters, I am also satisfied that Alphonse Forget acted
25 as he did because, knowing that these friends of his
needed tires and were not eligible therefor, he would ~~to do~~
them a good turn which, as a representative of the Rubber
Controller at Mont-Laurier, he had no right to do.

1 CONCLUSIONS

After having heard the evidence and the parties, examined the exhibits and documents of record, and deliberated, I beg to report as follows:

10 10 - That Alphonse Forget, local representative of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Mont-Laurier, and ex officio representative of the Rubber Controller, was guilty of favouritism towards Ben Laurin, garage owner, to the detriment of other garage owners of Mont-Laurier, and that it was common knowledge in Mont-Laurier and vicinity that it was easier and quicker to secure tires at the garage of Ben Laurin than at any other garage;

15 20 - That the said Alphonse Forget was also guilty of participation in the commission of two offences against the Wartime Prices and Trade Board regulations by procuring without a permit a tube for one J. H. Portelance and allowing a tire to be sold without a permit to one Wilfrid Lalonde.

20 Ottawa, this 7th day of March, 1944.

25 Roland Miller
Commissioner.