

the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) said at Carleton University and what she said yesterday, which we do not acknowledge at all, that does not constitute a question of privilege. I would be prepared to elaborate at great length.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) made no point at all. I thought the original point was that somehow there was a derogation of ministerial responsibility. He did not come to that conclusion even in the factual situation he laid before us, nor was that the conclusion of his remarks.

Your Honour indicated to the House leader of the Conservative party, who is supposed to have some experience with regard to the rules, that there was no question of privilege, but then the hon. member rose on another question of privilege, acknowledged the justification of Your Honour's ruling, and then proceeded to base the entire justification for his next question of privilege on the question of an alleged contradiction which was already ruled to be not a justification for a question of privilege at all.

The attempts of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton under the guise of a question of privilege have no justification whatsoever. He read from a transcript of tapes which he knows the Minister of National Health and Welfare has not had the opportunity to hear or to test their validity. He did that to dump it all on to the record under the guise of a question of privilege for which he knows there is no justification at all.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): How the hon. member can consider behaviour of that kind proper parliamentary conduct is frankly beyond me.

Mr. Speaker: With respect to the matter raised by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) I think it ought to be brought to a conclusion. I have made an adjudication on the question raised by the minister.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) raised a second question of privilege which, in a preliminary way, I have indicated is always proper. I have indicated that I felt initially that, even if the contradiction he refers to is in fact established—and it is in dispute—it does not constitute privilege. However, the hon. member raised an argument which I said I would examine.

It seems to me that it is not in keeping with our practices that a grievance raised by one member can become the subject of a motion of privilege by another, and I know there is a recent precedent which deals with that. I have indicated that I will reserve on the matter, bring that precedent into the House tomorrow, and finalize the matter with a ruling at that time.

Parliamentary Security

● (1542)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INTERIM REPORT ON MATTERS OF SECURITY

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, I should like to indicate to the House at this time a further interim report on the matters of security that have been raised in the House in the recent past.

As I indicated to the House yesterday in respect of the matter involving the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay), I had communicated to that member the contents of our preliminary investigation and asked for his response to it. This morning the hon. member for Central Nova and I met. It was his desire that the matter be pursued further. He informed me of the contents of his own examination of the circumstances and indicated his desire that the matter be carried further. He felt that the choice of an investigative force, because I had indicated that if it is to be carried further some investigative force other than our own security staff of the House of Commons would have to be used, should be left to me.

I have pursued the matter in a preliminary way with the Ottawa Police investigative force and asked for their co-operation and assistance in carrying this forward. I shall keep the House informed of the progress of that investigation.

In respect of the matter involving the office of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark), the meeting that I reported to the House yesterday did in fact take place yesterday afternoon, and at the present time, as a result of the meetings that have taken place between our officials and officials of the office of the Leader of the Opposition and their advisers, the telephone has been taken to the Bell Telephone laboratory where tests will be conducted. I expect those reports by late tomorrow, but in any case I ought to be in a position to give the House a full report on those investigations when the House resumes on Monday, bearing in mind that the House is not sitting on Friday.

* * *

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, during the oral question period, I willingly sat down after having asked a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin). You will find that the question I wanted to ask is quite justified, Mr. Speaker. I simply wanted to know if in her statement the Minister of National Health and Welfare really said that the security service had become so strong that it could investigate in just about any field without government knowledge. If the statement was made in public, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, a cabinet minister, has shown that the government has lost control over its security service. In these circumstances and in view of the concern this will create among all Canadians, a member of cabinet is involved. If the minister did not say this, it is important for her to stand up and say so in the House, and if she said this to make the students happy, this shows a serious lack of responsibility. I therefore think that the