

*Privilege—Mr. Broadbent*

**Mr. Broadbent:** All right, I will read it again. It is a quotation from the Solicitor General which occurred on January 17, 1977.

**Some hon. Members:** June.

**Mr. Broadbent:** I am sorry, June.

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

**An hon. Member:** That is the same type of mistake.

**Mr. Broadbent:** It reads as follows:

Our files and those of the RCMP contain no written report on the unlawful entry to the solicitor general.

The document in question, annexed to the minister's own affidavit—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Sworn to.

**Mr. Broadbent:**—sworn to by himself, is a list of material which, according to paragraph 5 of the affidavit, pertains directly to the break-in of L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec in the fall of 1972. The minister cannot have it both ways. Earlier in the question period he said that the document I referred to in my question—because I was basing it on his published information—did not pertain to the break-in.

Unless he has committed another incomprehensible error, he said in his own affidavit that all the documents listed on the last page pertain to the break-in. Unless he is going to correct that error, I take it for granted that his sworn statement holds. The document which he thinks is significantly different, because the date changes from 1972 to 1973, does not convince me.

I should like to come to the reason for that. As I have said, the Prime Minister, the present Solicitor General and the former solicitor general, now the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, said that they did not find out anything about this break-in until 1976. If the date changes from 1972 to 1973, how significant is that change?

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** What is the difference?

**Mr. Broadbent:** It is still 2½ years ahead of the time the Prime Minister and other members of the cabinet claim they knew anything about the break-in.

**An hon. Member:** So?

**Mr. Broadbent:** If the letter which, according to the affidavit, pertains to the break-in, and if it was written by General Dare, we know from earlier testimony that General Dare was fully cognizant of the events and fully cognizant of the break-in which took place in the fall of 1972. One would conclude that when he is writing on the subject of a break-in, he is writing to provide some information about the break-in to the Solicitor General.

On behalf of all members of the House and the people of Canada who are concerned about the integrity of the government, I should like to indicate that all I want is the informa-

[Mr. Broadbent.]

tion contained in that letter. It seems to me that it is very germane and it is hardly irresponsible. In fact, I would say it is a responsible course of action.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, as I have stated previously in the House, all the documents in question which are indicated in the annex referred to by the leader of the New Democratic Party, will be made available to the royal commission of inquiry set up by this government last July.

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

**Mr. Fox:** For that matter, it is very difficult to conclude that there has been any effort whatsoever at a cover-up. If that matter relates to a break-in or relates to information concerning knowledge brought to the attention of the minister, it will be brought to the attention of the royal commission. I have stated that a number of times in the House.

When the hon. member raised the question for the first time yesterday, I had the opportunity of speaking with him, and he told me that it related to a document which had been produced in Montreal under document number P. 26 tabled before the royal commission of inquiry. I was advised immediately by my own attorney who had appeared before that commission that document No. P. 26 refers to a letter which was written by the executive assistant, or the special assistant, to the then solicitor general and addressed to Mr. Jacques Hébert who was associated with L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec. It is a public document which is presently before the commission.

Then the hon. member raised a question concerning the document dated December 19, 1972. I caused an immediate search to be made of our files, and we could not come up with a document of that date.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Why did you not call me back?

**Mr. Fox:** If one wants to go through a matter carefully, it takes some time to come up with the facts. This morning I looked through the documents enclosed in an envelope. They pertained to the affidavit which I filed with the commission in Montreal. I discovered that there is a letter annexed to a note numbered D926-152D22. It is a letter from Mr. Dare to the present Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in December of 1973, and not 1972. The matter was excluded from the examination of the commission of inquiry because it did not refer to any illegal act whatsoever committed by the RCMP.

● (1522)

Even given that, Mr. Speaker, I am still willing to make the matter fully available to the McDonald royal commission of inquiry in order that they may satisfy themselves that that is indeed the case.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Table the letter.