

of Manitoba and myself an apology for the implication he has made and the inference to be drawn that we betrayed a confidence given by the Prime Minister.

In raising any question earlier in the House today I based it directly on a press statement which came out of the office of the Premier of Manitoba on Friday last. That press statement referred to a telex which was sent by the Premier of Manitoba in mid-May to the Prime Minister of Canada requesting a first ministers' conference to deal, among other things, with unemployment. More than a month later the Prime Minister replied that there would be no such conference held, at least immediately. In reply to that the Premier of Manitoba issued a public statement, and I assume, being a man of integrity, Mr. Schreyer, the Premier of Manitoba, was not revealing a confidential telex or telegram sent to him by the Prime Minister. Having made his own request public in the first place—and if the Prime Minister challenges this contention and I am mistaken, I will apologize to him—I am sure the Prime Minister replied to the premier not in a confidential way at all, but directly, in the normal course of correspondence. At any rate, in a press statement issued on Friday by the office of the Premier of Manitoba, the following paragraph appears:

The Prime Minister had replied June 22 that a first ministers' conference should be held some time in the coming months to deal with the issues raised by Premier Schreyer, but that such a meeting probably would require careful preparatory work in other ministerial areas. He—

That is a reference to the Prime Minister.

—also stated that job creation plans for the coming months were already close to completion when Mr. Schreyer's first telex of May 17 was received—

It seems to me very clear, Mr. Speaker, that if Premier Schreyer issued this statement publicly he was not betraying a confidence. Some very important questions have been raised, and I think the Prime Minister owes me an apology for suggesting that I am revealing something which is of a confidential nature. He also owes an apology to the Premier of Manitoba. Beyond that, on the very important issue of job creation, he owes an apology to the members of this House because the answers which he gave today did not make clear whether or not there were new job creation programs, as he suggested to Premier Schreyer there were.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I am called upon to make a whole series of apologies. I think if I explain the circumstances to the hon. member he might want to reconsider his request for apologies. My understanding, when I asked the hon. member the date of my letter to Premier Schreyer, was that the leader of the New Democratic Party had, indeed, a copy of my letter to Premier Schreyer in his hand. If the hon. member can say that that is not so, that he has not seen a copy of my letter to Premier Schreyer, then of course I will withdraw any inference that he is betraying a confidence.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Speaker, on the same question of privilege, it seems to me to be entirely irrelevant—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Paproski:** Produce the letter.

### RCMP

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) has raised, by way of a question of privilege, some remarks made by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) during the question period concerning, firstly, the Premier of Manitoba, which of course in this context, and I doubt in any context, would not constitute a question of privilege concerning the members of this House.

Secondly, in respect of his own participation in the question period—that is to say, the actions of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby—he indicated that the Prime Minister had indicated that the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby was compounding the disclosure of a confidence. The Prime Minister has responded to that point. In any case, it would seem to me that it would not constitute a question of privilege. The point has been dealt with by an equal contribution from both sides, and the matter ought not to go any further.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Thirteenth report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs—Mr. Cafik.

[Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.]

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

TABLING OF TELEGRAM FROM L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE DU QUÉBEC

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a copy of a telegram—and the English translation—which was attached to a letter from L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec, the Mouvement pour la défense des prisonniers politiques and the Coopérative des déménageurs du 1<sup>er</sup> mai, which I tabled in the House on June 30, 1977.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. This tabling, it seems to me, is a full response to the point of order raised earlier by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence), who raised the point that the minister had been compelled to table a letter, but that in the letter was reference to an enclosure and that the enclosure ought to be tabled as well. I am not going to decide at this point the precedents or the practices by which we ought to be bound. It is a very interesting argument as to whether or not it necessarily follows that, since a document can be held to be tabled, the enclosures or documents attached to it, and so on, might be as well. Perhaps that is an argument