

the Opposition. I will quote from his letter, which reads in part:

Perhaps it is appropriate at this time—

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize “at this time”. This letter was received in my office on October 18.

—to extend an invitation to you, as Leader of the Opposition, to attend a briefing that could be arranged at your convenience.

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

**Mr. Clark:** There is a difference between a briefing and regular briefings. There is also a very clear difference, which this Prime Minister appears unwilling to accept, between briefings and responsibility, including the responsibility to ask questions about methods and about potential illegalities.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the paragraph read by the Leader of the Opposition referred to practices in the United Kingdom and other countries where a practice has been developed of briefing the opposition from time to time on matters relating to national security. It was, I agree, only on October 18 that I made it quite clear that I had made the same offer to the previous leader of the opposition, as I am sure Mr. Pearson had made it to Mr. Diefenbaker, and probably Mr. Diefenbaker to Mr. Pearson.

The Leader of the Opposition has not yet had time to decide whether he wants such briefings or not. He has certainly not answered my letter, but he has told us today—he was probably too busy travelling.

**Mr. Clark:** I will reply before 18 months, Prime Minister.

**Mr. Trudeau:** He told us today, with great emphasis, that he did not consider it sufficient to attend “a” briefing. That is his emphasis. If he wants more than “a” briefing; if he wants some briefings, if he wants them in different form than have traditionally been accorded the leader of the opposition, let him say so and let him answer my letter. Let him tell us what kinds of briefings he wants, and we will see if they can be given.

**An hon. Member:** Oh, sit down; don’t waste time.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that if he thinks that in those briefings he will be able to ask members how they get information, who they get it from, and in which way, he will not get that information unless the law of the country is changed and the practices of time immemorial in this House are changed.

● (1512)

MR. BROADBENT—ALLEGED MISLEADING OF HOUSE IN ANSWER GIVEN BY SOLICITOR GENERAL

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a most serious question of privilege. In reply to a question put to the Prime Minister, the Solicitor General thinks that he has put to rest a matter which raises the integrity of the government. I want to say at the outset, on this serious question of privilege, that I want to deal with the points

*Privilege—Mr. Broadbent*

he raised, because he misled the House. Rather than solving or putting aside a certain problem, in my view, he has made it even more serious.

I put this point seriously and I believe it needs to be commented upon. The minister began by saying that morality plays a role in politics. I agree with him. It is for this reason that when I first learned of the alleged contents of the affidavit within two hours I phoned his colleague, the former solicitor general, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and told him that I had been given this serious information.

At that time I asked him if it was true. He said that he did not think so. Also, he indicated that he would look into it. At the same time, I repeated the phone calls to that minister because his integrity is under question here: I do not put it any more strongly than that. Yesterday morning I phoned him twice to see if I could receive an answer, and no call came back.

**An hon. Member:** Which minister?

**Mr. Broadbent:** The former solicitor general.

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

**Mr. Broadbent:** Then I raised it as a serious question by asking the present minister to investigate it. He did not reply to me. I waited two hours this morning for a reply, and none was forthcoming. So he raises the question of morality on the issue. I come now to the substance of the issue.

**An hon. Member:** It is about time.

**Mr. Broadbent:** The minister has said that the affidavit, a legal document over his signature, residing with the Quebec inquiry contains a significant typographical error. I should like to point out that it took a question by us in the House of Commons to elicit the information that that very significant error, on which the Quebec inquiry is basing part of its judgment, has come to light. Would it have come to light if it had not been pursued in the House of Commons? I know not, because it was a document that the minister said was not going to be made available to the inquiry. That was a careless mistake. It did not originate from this side of the House; once again, it was from the other side of the House.

There were issues raised in the changing of the date from 1972 to 1973 which do not in one whit cancel the problem. I remind the minister that the Prime Minister and the former solicitor general are on record as saying that no such correspondence on the question of the break-in exists. As reported at page 6793 of *Hansard* dated June 17, 1977, the present Solicitor General is quoted as saying the following:

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

**An hon. Member:** Pardon?

**Mr. Broadbent:** Well, you can look it up.

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