

Yesterday in the House of Commons, the Social Credit Party of Canada had, according to our rules, the opportunity to put a motion on its allotted day for the consideration of the business of supply, a motion which I moved myself, which was debated by more than three members of the Social Credit Party of Canada, and which had been preceded by two oral questions and a motion moved under Standing Order 43. Yet, completely overlooking those debates in the House of Commons, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation saw fit to report on the parking problem of the hon. member for Verdun. Can the Prime Minister assure the House that he himself will settle the parking problem of the hon. member for Verdun so that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation can report to the Canadian people on what is going on in the House?

* * *

[English]

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

REQUEST FOR NAMES OF ECONOMIC DECISION-MAKERS
NEEDED TO AGREE TO RESTRAINT PRIOR TO ENDING CONTROLS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The right hon. gentleman has stated it would be folly to remove controls except and until there is "agreement among the main economic decision-makers" on the whole question of voluntary restraint. Would the Prime Minister tell us who he considers to be suitable economic decision-makers in Canada to reach such an agreement? Who will speak for business, for example, or for the farmers or for the consumers?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): That is a difficult and complex question and it is one to which we address ourselves in a green paper tabled last week by the Minister of Finance. I hope the hon. member will peruse the chapter relating to that point.

TYPE OF AGREEMENT SOUGHT PRIOR TO ENDING CONTROLS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, that question was put to the Minister of Finance in the light of the green paper and the Minister of Finance also told us it was a complicated question and one to which he could not give a ready answer. Would the Prime Minister indicate what kind of agreement he is seeking? Is it a written agreement? These aspects are certainly not dealt with in the green paper.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The most binding type of agreement would be the one I would prefer.

Mr. Stevens: Would the Prime Minister tell us what, in his mind, would constitute a binding agreement affecting business, labour and the consumer?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is no doubt aware of the hypothesis contained in his question.

Oral Questions

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

BREAK-IN AT L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE—PERSON WITH
WHOM PRIME MINISTER CHECKED PRIOR TO DENIAL OF
MINISTERIAL KNOWLEDGE

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. It relates to an urgent and pressing matter, involving, as it does, the very credibility of the office the right hon. gentleman now holds. It concerns the confirmation yesterday by one, Pierre Capiello, of allegations made in this House last Friday respecting a registered letter sent to the then solicitor general in relation to the break-in and burglary of L'Agence de Presse Libre in Quebec some three days after the actual break-in on, I believe, October 10. Outside the House last Thursday afternoon, the Prime Minister made two points at a press conference. First, he said that as soon as any minister was informed the investigation which eventually resulted in these charges immediately took place, and, second, if my rough French translation is correct, he made the point that it was several years after the break-in before any minister knew of the illegality.

● (1430)

My question to the Prime Minister is this. I have great respect for the office which he holds, and I think that this attacks the credibility of his office. With whom did he check in relation to those rather blanket denials of any knowledge; and specifically did the Prime Minister check before he made those statements with the then solicitor general, the present Minister of Supply and Services?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is assuming or insinuating that my replies were incorrect. I still hold them to be correct. I am talking of illegality in so far as it concerns the RCMP. Any break-in is illegal. Unless I am mistaken, the hon. member is implying that I was referring to any illegality. I am referring to any illegality in which the federal government directly or indirectly would be involved, and my statement still stands.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Prime Minister is misinterpreting my words but I am sure it is my fault. I am talking about knowledge, ministerial knowledge, of an illegality, of a break-in, of the involvement of a federal police force, among others. I think this was the matter the Prime Minister referred to in the press conference. It is completely different from sentencing. It is completely different from the actual break-in. I am referring to ministerial knowledge of events and the circumstances relating thereto, and I think this was a very direct, blanket denial of any ministerial knowledge at that time. This is what I am directing my question to and it is what I would appreciate the Prime Minister referring to. Did he specifically check with the Solicitor General's two predecessors in respect of their knowledge of this matter at that time, or even now?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the hon. member did not get my previous answer. I am telling him that the answers I gave at the press conference and in the House