Oral Questions

(1200)

Mr. Allmand: I will be glad to give the House the date on which this recommendation was made to me and to the Prime Minister. I will also be glad to give the House the number of days the one vehicle was out of service for the Prime Minister due to the fact it was on loan for visiting heads of state and heads of governments. Besides Her Majesty, there are many people who visit this country and require this top security. As I say, I will be glad to give the right hon. member information as to the exact number of days in the past few years in which the one vehicle was not available because of this reason.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Before we leave this important subject, may I ask the Prime Minister whether he will seriously consider providing the leaders of minority parties with bullet proof Pintos or Vegas.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what gratitude I would get for that. I remind the leader of the New Democratic Party that when I asked the airlines to provide them with free passes for travel within Canada, something which had not been done by previous Prime Ministers, I did not hear any thank you to the airlines for that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order. I do not understand the purport of the Prime Minister's remarks, unless it was to take a crack at me as well as the others.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: I wish to make it very clear that I thank the Prime Minister for his courtesy. I have been very grateful for the courtesy ever since, not only as far as I am concerned but insofar as the party I lead is concerned. If the Prime Minister feels I have not duly thanked him, I now thank him publicly.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, my answer was given in the context of the question which referred to leaders of minor parties. I am glad to hear the Leader of the Opposition include the party he leads.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: The natives are restless. They sense the lion moving in for the kill. This whole question of bullet proofing did not arise until the time of the present Prime Minister. The other Prime Ministers were all very popular gentlemen. It has only been necessary to bullet proof these cars since the present Prime Minister took office.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain).]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Trudeau: May I answer this, Mr. Speaker? I just want to point out that the hon. member is right. The procedure was begun with me. However, I should point out that in the time the right hon. member for Prince Albert was Prime Minister, they should have had kickproof cars. He will recall his car was kicked when he was getting out at the Chateau Laurier.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the right hon. member must have been facetious because it has no basis in truth and he knows that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have now spent a considerable amount of time on the non-point of order raised by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby. The hon. member for Ontario gave notice yesterday of his intention to raise a question of privilege relative to the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North, after checking the record. Obviously, the proper time to have done that would have been at the beginning of today's session. If the hon. member were to be entitled to do it now, he would require the unanimous consent of the House. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVILEGE

MR. CAFIK—REFERENCE TO REMARKS OF HON. MEMBER FOR WINNIPEG NORTH

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thank the House very sincerely for giving me this opportunity to reply in respect of a question of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow).

In that question of privilege, which did not directly deal with me, the hon. member made references to myself, my constituency and a person who was an employee in my constituency. The hon. member indicated in the statement he made at that time that a payment of \$3,900 to Mr. J. Forester constituted a clear conflict of interest situation.

I must point out to the House that I fail to understand how that kind of casual allegation can be made. First, the \$3,900 in question was not paid directly by the House of Commons or the government of Canada, but by senior citizens in the town of Ajax who made an application for a New Horizons grant. Second, the hon. member said these payments began to be made when this same J. Forester was an employee of mine as a special assistant. That is simply not true.

I wish to relate the facts. First, in respect to the two New Horizons grants: According to my check yesterday, the first grant was made in May 1973. The second grant was made in December 1973. On neither of these applications did the name Joe Forester appear.