

● (1502)

[English]

PRIVILEGE

MR. RODRIGUEZ—ALLEGED MISLEADING OF HOUSE BY
SOLICITOR GENERAL

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. It refers to a question which I directed to the Solicitor General (Mr. Blais) on Wednesday, April 25, 1978, and the response which he gave at that time. As reported at page 4828 of *Hansard* dated April 25, 1978, my question was as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Solicitor General. It arises from recent testimony before the McDonald commission which has shown that members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police took part in illegal activities for which they could be prosecuted under the Criminal Code. The Solicitor General is quoted in today's *Globe and Mail* as saying he is not planning to take any action in connection with these breaches of the Criminal Code. Can the minister tell us why he does not intend to take action against those who broke the law of Canada?

The Solicitor General's response was very clear. His reply reads as follows:

The hon. gentleman has undoubtedly read the terms of reference of the McDonald commission. They include power to inquire into procedures which might not have been authorized by specific legal provisions. The evidence in the past week has shown—if this is what the hon. member is referring to—that there have been what are called surreptitious entries. A legal opinion has been forthcoming from the Department of Justice to the effect that these procedures are legal.

I note the Solicitor General did not say "some" or "a few". He said "these procedures are legal." He continued by saying:

There is a decided opinion with reference to their legality, and I wish the evidence were completely adduced before the commission so that the inquiry, which is proceeding apace, would be able to make a judgment and bring in its own recommendations.

In today's edition of the *Globe and Mail*, the Solicitor General informed the public of Canada that, in effect, he found his thought processes were indeed obscure. He found there is no such legal opinion forthcoming to indicate that these surreptitious entries were legal.

I submit the Solicitor General misled the House of Commons. He did not know what he was speaking about. He rose and said things which were not correct. I suggest that he has misled the House. He ought to show some courage and commonsense by standing up in the House like a man and by saying to the House and the people of Canada that he was wrong, and that he apologizes for misleading them.

It is fine for him to make the statements he has made as to how he is prepared to lay things before attorneys general, that he is so open, et cetera. But the fact of the matter is that he misled the House last Wednesday. He should rise and apologize for having done so. We would have a lot more respect for him if he would conduct himself in an open and frank fashion.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) raises by way of a question of privilege a matter which was touched on during oral questions today. Of course, it does not fall within the realm of a question of privilege. In

Order Paper Questions

any case, if it did, it is not followed by a motion which would call for any action on the part of the Chair. I would have to see such a motion to be able to determine in a final way whether or not the matter is a question of privilege. Even if it does come within the general lettering which might touch upon privilege, without a motion there is nothing for the Chair to act upon.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

HIGHWAYS

TABLING OF AGREEMENT WITH NEW BRUNSWICK

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 41(2), I should like to table in both official languages copies of a highway agreement respecting an improvement between New Brunswick and Canada.

Mr. Ed Lumley: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I missed the call for the tabling of documents.

Mr. Speaker: Is there consent to revert to the tabling of documents?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

TABLING OF REFERENCE FROM ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

Mr. Ed Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, herewith is a copy of a reference from the Anti-Inflation Board to the administrator for tabling in the House, pursuant to subsection 17(2) of the Anti-Inflation Act, in our two official languages.

* * *

[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: 1039, 1381, 1,474, 1,483, 1,505 and 1,506.

[Text]

TRAVEL TO VANCOUVER

Question No. 1,039—**Mr. MacKay:**

During the first week of December 1977, did any members of the Prime Minister's office travel to Vancouver and, if so (a) for what purpose (b) how