

When he left the company his security clearance ceased by the very fact of his leaving.

Later on, as reported on the right hand side of the same page and speaking about Dr. Treu, the Prime Minister said: "... he concluded he no longer had the clearance of that job..."

The facts are that in December of 1972 Northern Electric, with whom Dr. Treu had been working as one of the advisers in connection with a most complex and useful scheme in relation to the NATO countries, of which Canada is still a part, got out of the business. At the strong urging of both the government and Northern Electric a company was formed by Dr. Treu to take over in December of 1972.

In June of 1973 Dr. Treu was among those attending a security meeting of a classified nature where he was "badged" and security cleared, and during which he talked to Mr. Jenkyns, the security clearance officer acting as liaison with NATO. Mr. Jenkyns was the security officer for the Department of Supply and Services. In June of 1974, Dr. Treu, security cleared and wearing his badge, attended a similar meeting. Finally, a letter dated January 5, 1976, over the signature of Hugh Grant, director of the defence programs branch of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, invited Dr. Treu to attend a meeting of that branch which was to be held in Ottawa during the week of April 5, 1976.

I sincerely hope that the Prime Minister will set the record straight with respect to these issues, and I hope that, as he continues to play around with his constitutional tinkertoys, someone who has some knowledge of the law and human rights and natural justice will see that the proper kind of arrangements are written into the constitution in that regard.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman stated at the beginning of his question of privilege that he was acting on behalf of a person who is pleading his case before the appeal court. Obviously he is acting as a lawyer properly should before the courts. He is pleading the case of his client. The courts have already decided the client is guilty under the law. I take it that if the lawyer opposite us wants to continue pleading the case, he can go before the courts and do so.

The hon. member is now presenting a case not as a member of parliament but as a party to litigation in a criminal matter. He is apparently giving evidence which he got from his client. I have contrary evidence. I have evidence from the government that the contracts received from NATO during that period were not in classified areas. In some subtle way the hon. member admits this, but he says the results of the contracts, presumably work that Mr. Treu did, ended up being classified, I suppose by NATO. That is not surprising. A person who is not classified can do work for a government or for the private sector, or for an international organization, which can then decide to classify it. The person doing the work is not the one who is going to decide whether the receiver of the work will communicate it to the enemy or not.

### *Order Paper Questions*

I think it is interesting that the hon. gentleman should be using the House of Commons to plead a case which is before the appeal court, but I suggest he be properly qualified before the bar and get along with pleading his case in the proper place.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. It may be that the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) as drawn attention to what is essentially a disagreement with respect to the Prime Minister's statement of an earlier day. In the final analysis, from a procedural point of view, I note he has attached no motion to his remarks, obviating the need for action by the Chair.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ACT, 1978

MEASURE TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-60, to amend the Constitution of Canada with respect to matters coming within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, and to approve and authorize the taking of measures necessary for the amendment of the constitution with respect to certain other matters.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 1,465, 1,710, 1,711 and 1,837.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Text]

### BUILDING PROJECTS

Question No. 1,465—**Mr. Alexander:**

What building projects are in the five years capital works budget for the southern Ontario region (Niagara Falls to Woodstock) by (a) the Department of Public Works (b) the Department of Transport (c) the Department of External Affairs (d) the Department of National Defence (e) the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce (f) Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (g) other Crown corporations?