

province of Ontario, since, if an illegal break-in had taken place it would have been an illegal act committed in Ontario and, in the circumstances, the matter would come under the jurisdiction of the attorney general of Ontario. I have also directed my officials to examine the information, to determine if there are any implications concerning the department of the Solicitor General but have not yet received a report on the matter.

Mr. Oberle: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am concerned about two distinct infractions, one of them, of course, being the crime of breaking and entering which, as the Solicitor General rightly says comes under the jurisdiction of the attorney general of Ontario. However, an investigation was carried out in the interest of national security, which certainly falls under the jurisdiction of the Solicitor General of Canada. I ask the Solicitor General, how much more time does he need in order to make a statement to the House on these allegations, and what will be the nature of his further investigation?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I think I have already indicated to the House a number of times that the RCMP was not involved in any way with the break-in at Praxis—

Mr. Dick: What about the offence of possessing stolen goods?

Mr. Fox:—Corporation. Therefore I do not think the rest of the question follows.

Mr. Broadbent: What about the possession of stolen documents?

Mr. Fox: Perhaps if hon. members would care to refresh their memories by reading what I said yesterday, as reported in *Hansard*, they would see that the documents in question were turned over to the Metropolitan Toronto police department.

Mr. Broadbent: After seven years.

Mr. Fox: Yes, but no matter what the length of time is they were turned over.

Mr. Broadbent: Come on!

Mr. Dick: It is still possession of stolen property.

Mr. Fox: The Crown attorney in the province of Ontario looked at the documents and concluded that there was no illegal action on the part of the RCMP in that regard. I do not know if hon. members are suggesting—

Mr. Broadbent: Who kept the stolen property for seven years? Was that not an offence?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: Why don't you lay an information?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, some hon. members of this House obviously would like to substitute their judgment for that of

the Crown attorney. As far as we are concerned on my side of the House, we are willing to take the advice of the law officers of the Crown.

Oral Questions

BREAK-IN AT PRAXIS CORPORATION—INVESTIGATION OF THOSE INVOLVED IN DESTRUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like particularly to ask the Solicitor General if the RCMP officer, whose name I gave him on Monday and who is alleged to have been directly involved in the conversion of the documents, has been investigated. Further, has the minister investigated the already admitted involvement of Inspector Venner in the destruction of the original documents stolen from Praxis Corporation?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure what the hon. member is getting at. At some point he suggested that someone would have been in the Department of the Solicitor General—he mentioned the Solicitor General's office—who would have been involved in some way in the Machiavellian scheme which he described and in which he apparently believes. With respect to the precise names he has given me, no one in the Solicitor General's department at that time bore those names. However, I want to make sure that neither the first name nor the family name is in question. Once I have completed the inquiries, I will be pleased to make a report to the House. If, of course, there is a question concerning an investigation which the attorney general of the province of Ontario ought to be undertaking, the appropriate course would be to have that investigation carried out by the attorney general of the province of Ontario rather than on the floor of the House.

● (1420)

ALLEGATIONS OF ILLEGAL BREAK-INS BY FORCE—REASON FOR REFUSAL TO HOLD INQUIRY

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister aware that during the past 24 hours a former RCMP corporal has said that illegal break-ins have been a continuing practice for a number of years by the RCMP. That statement flatly contradicts statements and assurances coming from the top level of the RCMP in recent weeks. Keeping in mind that senior officials in the RCMP and several ministers of the Crown systematically concealed knowledge about a break-in from the government, I would like to ask the Prime Minister what apparently changed his mind in the past 48 hours or overnight about the need for a specific inquiry into the accountability of the RCMP to its political authority?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have constantly taken the view that the break-in in Montreal, which was an illegal act by an RCMP officer, was an aberration, an incident, and an isolated one. I have had repeated assurances from the Commissioner of the RCMP and from the Director General of Security that this was an isolated incident and it was in no way a general or special practice of