

was written by a journalist on the west coast when the minister was out there on another matter. I suggest his memory is failing him. That article was written after a long, detailed interview with the minister here, in his Ottawa office, an interview exclusively dealing with the break-in. I remind the minister of that slight misremembering of a fact.

On procedure, I agree with the substance of the government House leader's argument. This matter should not be referred to a special committee of the House unless a change is made. I categorically disagree, however, with his statement that the minister, in making his statement today, resolved the issue. As we said some days ago, we need a public inquiry. We still need it.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) has not satisfied members of the House with his statement concerning the events of that unfortunate period in 1972. There is a great deal to be said in support of a public inquiry for which members of my party have repeatedly called. But the matter of the inquiry rests in the hands of the government of Canada, which so far has engaged in stonewalling tactics. The leader of the New Democratic Party does not think the committee on privileges and elections would be an appropriate forum in which to examine this question.

Mr. Broadbent: Make a charge.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Let me say, sir, that an examination by that committee, which would treat this matter with the fairness with which it has traditionally treated other matters, would be better than not having any inquiry at all. That is the position in which we are left.

Mr. Broadbent: Make a charge.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Some questions must still be answered—

Mr. Nystrom: Make a charge, Walter.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): —with respect to the matter.

Mr. Nystrom: Make a charge, Walter.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I will make a charge. I think the minister is absolutely incompetent, and he demonstrated that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, someone said that I should lay a charge, and I will lay a charge.

Mr. Goyer: You are stupid.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Is it reasonable, sir—

Privilege—Mr. Goyer

Mr. Nystrom: Walter, that is quite a charge.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I do not like to be provoked.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) may continue in a moment. We have at present a combination of procedural difficulties confronting us. Before proceeding further we must decide whether it is in order for the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) to move the motion he has proposed. Obviously, we must clear up that procedural difficulty. Perhaps other hon. members wish to contribute to that narrow procedural point which I can dispose of without further argument. Perhaps I could hear the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates) on that point. Is the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton continuing on that point?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am continuing with my statement, I hope with the same latitude as you granted the leader of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is still open to the House to question the minister on his question of privilege. He has made that offer and it is still open. However, I have a motion before me and I must decide, on a point of order, whether that motion can, in fact, be moved; that is to say, whether it is in order. The decision on that does not affect the continuation of the argument or discussion on which we were embarked previously concerning the minister's statement, but I must decide whether the motion just handed to me which comes from the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), can be moved. Is it in order? If there is further argument on that point, I will hear it, after which I shall return to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton and hear him on the minister's statement.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I have been in this House—

An hon. Member: Too long.

Mr. Coates: It may be too long for you, my friend, but any time you want to run against me we shall see who will win that battle. We are in a most difficult position because we ignored the rules of the House. A member of this House rose on what was to be a question of privilege; it ended up, apparently, as a statement on motions. I have never, in my 20 years as a member, seen another member rise in this House on a question of privilege and end up answering questions about his responsibilities as solicitor general at a previous time under a previous administration. But that is the situation at present. I can appreciate why the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) tried to bring sanity to what has become an insane situation in this House.

The minister rose and made a statement, supposedly on a question of privilege. Then he began answering them. I suggest this should properly be done in the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections where members would have the opportunity not only to examine his words but the words of others