

*Oral Questions***YOUNG CANADA WORKS**

METHOD USED TO DELIVER APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): My question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. The applications for Young Canada Works grants were delivered to the 11 members of the minister's advisory board in the riding of Capilano by courier, at a cost of \$7.50. For the Capilano riding alone, this is a cost of \$82.50 over and above the minister's frank or the official government envelope. If this were repeated in other ridings in Canada, the cost would be about \$22,000.

I should like to ask the minister if this use of the expensive courier service in a period of restraint is an official departmental condemnation of the Canadian postal system.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, my answer to the latter question is no; I think we have one of the finest postal systems in the world.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Then why don't you use it?

Mr. Cullen: I guess we could fill this room with letters about mail delivered on time, but hon. members opposite are always ready to criticize the postal workers and the outside workers. They refer to "kangaroo courts" when they conduct their in-house operations. I do not think that does the postal service much good. If the hon. member had really been interested in an answer, he could have given me notice of his question and I would have checked it out. However, I will do so.

Mr. Huntington: The only thing you can fill this room with is letters of complaint which all hon. members in this room get about the condition of the postal service.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: For the minister and his department to be spending \$7.50 to deliver these brown, government envelopes does not require prepared notice of the question: all it needs is an answer—

Some hon. Members: Order.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

INVESTIGATIONS BY SECURITY SERVICE

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General, who is aware that on Friday the Deputy Prime Minister was unable to answer this particular question accurately. In 1969, the government delivered a mandate to our security service to conduct certain investigations into groups that might support or advocate separatism. The following year, in 1970, the government received a 23-

[Miss Bégin.]

page report identifying by name those groups and a description of their activities, including the Parti Québécois.

• (1500)

Having given that mandate, having received the report, and knowing the continuation of the investigation was foremost in the minds of the security service, did no predecessor of the minister or any other minister, including a justice minister, a prime minister or a member of the cabinet committee on security and intelligence ever ask, in the period subsequent to 1970, what methods and procedures were being used by the security service to fulfil the mandate the government had given it?

[*Translation*]

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to read the question asked by the hon. member and the answer given by the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council. I have nothing to add to what was said except that some of the conclusions drawn by the hon. member, which are reflected in the preamble of his question, obviously demonstrate the accuracy of the answer by the President of the Privy Council, namely that we should not jump to conclusions before the proceedings of the McDonald commission are over.

[*English*]

Mr. Jarvis: Mr. Speaker, again my question is directed to the Solicitor General. I have read the answer of the Deputy Prime Minister, who said no investigation was ordered into a political party. That was not the question at all. The question was that the government had ordered an investigation into various groups and their activities respecting certain political activities, not political parties. A political party happened to be one of the objects of surveillance.

Is the minister saying that the terms of reference of the McDonald commission are so encompassing as to exclude from the House of Commons its right to judge ministerial competence and responsibility and, specifically, that of previous solicitors general? Is that the position of the minister?

Mr. Blais: Of course not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have a notice from the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart), but there is an outstanding matter of order from Friday in respect of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker).

* * *

PRIVILEGEMR. DIEFENBAKER—ALLEGED OMISSION FROM "HANSARD" OF
STANDING ORDER 43 MOTION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I discussed this matter fully with Your Honour this morning, and I will review something of what actually took place. I moved a motion on March 7 commending what was being