

ALLEGED DISMISSAL OF MEMBER OF SECURITY UNIT FOR
REFUSING TO DESTROY PROPERTY

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to thank you because we have heard a whole series of speeches under the guise of questions and even lengthier answers, and this is not the way, in my humble opinion, to conduct the question period.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member has a question, would he please put it.

An hon. Member: He will, like the Tories.

Mr. Brewin: My question is fairly brief and it is addressed to the Solicitor General. Has the Solicitor General inquired into the evidence given to the Keable inquiry in Montreal to the effect that members of an anti-terrorist squad, unit or group, or whatever you call it, attached, I presume, to the security forces, were ordered to smash a summer cottage owned by someone suspected—I emphasize the word suspected—of being a terrorist, and that a member of the unit was dismissed for refusing to carry out this order. I would like to ask the minister, if he has looked into that case and knows about the fact, what he intends to do about this grave injustice.

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): If the hon. member is referring to some of the evidence that came out in Montreal, I believe it was yesterday, I have inquired into the matter and I have seen the response from the RCMP which is to the effect that the member of the force who left that unit was transferred to Paris in 1972 at his own request.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. CLARK—ANSWER BY PRIME MINISTER ON "BUGGING" OF MEMBERS' OFFICES

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege concerning a matter which I believe affects the privileges of all members of the House. I should say, sir, that I take the first available opportunity to raise this matter, as did my colleague, the hon. member for Central Nova, on Monday and as the traditions of the House of Commons, as the hon. member for Spadina will know, require.

I should say that the question of privilege I will raise relates, or may well relate, to the charge or allegation that has just been made by the Prime Minister of Canada that electronic devices were planted by members of this party in offices of members of this party. That is a clear allegation that the Prime Minister has just made, and if he is a man of honour I am sure he will either stand in his place when I finish my remarks and cite the evidence which supports that allegation, or else he will stand up and withdraw it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Privilege—Mr. Clark

An hon. Member: Resign.

Mr. Allmand: Let us hear the evidence for all the nonsense you have been spreading around.

An hon. Member: Why don't you listen?

Mr. Clark: If the former solicitor general wants to speak, we will be delighted to hear him.

An hon. Member: Rise.

Mr. Clark: He had an opportunity all Monday night during the long debate, and he sat there silent.

An hon. Member: You are a fraud, Allmand.

Mr. Clark: Immediately following the revelations of the hon. member for Central Nova on Monday of this week, officials of my office authorized an examination of the offices of the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. We received this morning a report of the professional firm undertaking that examination. They report the discovery of a device within a telephone in the conference room of the Leader of the Opposition. The firm advises that—

The conference room telephone was capable of being used as an eavesdropping device and, in fact, still was capable of being an eavesdropping device until 8.10 p.m. on Monday, October 31, 1977.

That is the time the device was dismantled. As Your Honour knows, I submitted that full report today to you, as the responsible officer for the security of these buildings, for any further action that Your Honour might deem necessary or appropriate, which action may well include the reference of the whole matter to the appropriate committee of the House. Of course, in awaiting Your Honour's decision in this regard and your review of this matter, I would like to reserve my rights under privilege in the House.

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege, or on a different one with respect to myself, whichever you prefer. First, I want to say that I think the motion by my friend, the hon. member for Spadina, was entirely legitimate. I thank him for it and, although it might have been more carefully drawn up, I trust that it will assist the House in getting to the bottom of the affair.

I want to say to the Prime Minister that I can understand his consternation. I have noted from time to time, in reading *Hansard*, that he has expressed, usually in the form of heckling, great reservations about private detectives, which I deplore because I think private detectives, like everyone else including politicians, include some good ones and some bad ones, so I do not know why he is so paranoiac about them. In any event, I simply want to say, for the record, that I have no idea, under what circumstances or anything else concerning this listening device, where it came from. Certainly, I had no knowledge of it, nor anyone connected with me, that I know of.

I want to say, as well, that I trust that the Prime Minister, if he is really serious in his allegation that I had anything to do