

the political climate of that time—concerning the illegal acts of the security branch—did not justify such an action by the RCMP?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to check the date of the two *Hansards* where I rose on a question of privilege about that issue. Obviously the office of the hon. member did not have time to provide him with that information.

[English]

REASON FOR FAILURE TO SUPPLY KEABLE INQUIRY WITH
ORGANIZATION CHART

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General, and it follows an answer he gave earlier in this House in which he listed a number of documents his department found great objection to producing before the Keable inquiry. Among those documents—and the one which seemed to bother him the most—he mentioned the organizational chart of the security branch as one he could not possibly turn over to the inquiry. Given that under the constitution of this country provincial attorneys general are given a clear mandate to investigate criminal activity, whether that activity is by the police or by anyone else, and to determine who gives orders for criminal activity, can the Solicitor General advise the House how the Keable inquiry can possibly come to a determination as to who gave the orders for the illegal acts in Quebec unless it receives the co-operation of the Solicitor General with regard to the organization chart, or at least the chain of command within the force?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member's question is quite simple. Ever since March, 1976 there has been very close co-operation between the federal government and my predecessor and the department of the solicitor general of the province of Quebec. All the information the provincial department wanted concerning the APLQ matter was brought to its attention. It is also a fact that the province of Quebec can get all the evidence it wishes because we filed with the Keable commission all material relating to the entry of the APLQ headquarters in 1972.

● (1442)

We have also indicated that all persons in the chain of command, and they have all been identified in those documents or through my counsel for the inquiry, are willing to testify in front of that commission. If people are really interested in finding out who did what in connection with a possible illegal entry, the solution is not in obtaining information on the day-to-day operations of the RCMP or requesting the files on RCMP matters that are not related to the entry. The solution is in examining under oath the people who were involved in a position of command at that time. All those people have indicated their willingness to appear before the commission, but not all have even yet been invited to attend.

Oral Questions

SUGGESTION INFORMATION BE GIVEN KEABLE INQUIRY AT IN
CAMERA SESSION

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, it seems perfectly clear that the Keable inquiry itself is not satisfied with the cooperation that the Solicitor General has provided. In view of the fact there is an in camera provision under the Keable inquiry, why does the Solicitor General not take that commission into his confidence? If there are security matters, why does the Solicitor General not deal with those matters in camera with no public exposure whatsoever in those sensitive areas? At least the Keable inquiry could find out who gave the order for the illegal entry.

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, there is no problem whatsoever in the Keable commission finding out who gave the order for the entry into the APLQ premises. I gave that in my previous response. As to the hon. member's suggestion that we turn over all federal agencies to any provincial commission that is set up, that is not the position of this government.

* * *

SOCIAL SERVICES

CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES ON FUNDING—POSSIBILITY
OF LEGISLATION THIS SESSION

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. It is related to the question asked by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi. In asking it I would assure the hon. lady that the new government in Manitoba is most anxious to proceed with this legislation because we are hosting the Rehabilitation International Congress and this legislation will have to be in place. In view of the fact the former Minister of National Health and Welfare in effect scuttled this legislation when he changed the financial arrangements with the provinces unilaterally in an abrupt press release of September 16, and the high priority that hon. gentleman, who now has responsibility for federal-provincial relations, gave to this legislation, will the hon. lady call the provincial ministers together at the earliest possible moment to restore the consensus that has been shattered by the arbitrary action of the former minister?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the premise put forward in the last part of the hon. member's question. All this work is continuing in an effort to find a solution for the betterment of the lives of all Canadians. I know of the hon. member's personal interest in the field of help to the handicapped and the disabled. He can be assured that this block funding still completely covers them. That was made very clear to the provinces. As to the meeting that will I hope take place in the near future, he could help me by asking the new minister in Manitoba to send me a reply.