

students of Carleton University, and his remarks were based on what appeared in that article.

In addition to that, we now have the tapes which were played on the CBC this morning, and we have a transcript of those remarks. I have a transcript in my hand, as did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark). I think one or two of the sentences he referred to can be quoted again, just to support the position taken yesterday by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby that the Minister of National Health and Welfare had demonstrated a difference of opinion between herself and the Solicitor General on the issues that are at stake.

For example, according to the transcript of her words that we heard on the radio this morning, she said:

... I think Francis Fox should clearly state—give the message—that he disagrees with what the police did, more than defending them or explaining that they might have had good reason.

Sir, if that is not differing with the Solicitor General, I do not know what the word "difference" means. At the conclusion of the comments by the Leader of the Opposition, he referred to the mentality or the state of opinion in Quebec in 1973. We were asked by the Solicitor General to be generous and forgiving to the RCMP because of the state which existed at that time. The Minister of National Health and Welfare, in her remarks at Carleton University, indicated that as a Quebecer she disagrees with what was said to be the state at that time, and if they had carried that on, "they might have bugged the complete province of Quebec".

I should like to return to the earlier remarks of the minister in the transcript of what was given over the radio this morning. The minister said this:

I think it is absolutely stupid that they would go and steal lists of memberships of political parties, in this case the Parti Québécois. And I find unreal that they would put fire to a barn.

Surely that is an opinion totally different than that expressed by the Solicitor General, who has argued that we should understand the situation—

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

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Just a minute! The Solicitor General said that we should realize that the things done by the RCMP special unit were done from the highest of motives because of the situation. But the Minister of National Health and Welfare said the following:

This being said, they have gadgets of national security, of surveillance, so big that they, if you, the government, start trying to control them or master what goes on or look into the files—you know, say you, the Minister sets a meeting of the directors and wants to see files and all that he doesn't know—and none of us know—what's the next step because they can be using—that's my feeling—they can be using gadgets the way they want.

We happen to agree with the sentiments expressed by the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

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

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** My point in rising—and I think it is my duty, as well as my right to do so—is

### *Privilege—Miss Bégin*

to say that it is unfair to charge the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby in his remarks yesterday of making statements for which there was no foundation.

Yesterday my hon. friend said that the logic of all this was that there was a cover-up—he did not accuse the hon. minister of alleging that there was a cover-up—but, I submit that the very sentences I have read from the transcript of what we heard over the radio this morning suggest that the minister felt, when she was making these remarks, that the Solicitor General was not really doing his job; he was just being a messenger boy; and instead of defending the police, and instead of saying what they had done had good reason and good purpose, he should have told them that it was stupid and that it was wrong.

I feel my leader was quite justified in the remarks he made yesterday and that the minister's charge against him is unwarranted. In conclusion, I should like to refer to the last words in the transcript which I have, where the minister said, "Eh, bon. That's all for the RCMP."

I am sure Your Honour noted, because Your Honour always does when a member raises a question of privilege, that the hon. minister offered no motion. If she has a question of privilege, she should be prepared to carry it through. If she is prepared to ask leave to present a motion to refer this matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, so that the tapes can be produced and the entire matter can be gone into, we in this party would be happy to agree to such a motion.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) was quoted by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent). The argument which was established yesterday by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby was itself incidental to an argument which many members claimed in the first instance was an incidental argument by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

● (1532)

When the Prime Minister was replying to a question of privilege, he in turn expressed an opinion in the House which was similar to other opinions expressed by other hon. members. That was referred to by many and described as an argument which was really incidental to the main question of privilege. In turn the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby said that those opinions were not being expressed by the opposition solely on the basis of their own views, but in fact on the basis of some views expressed by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin). Therefore the question was twice removed from the main question of privilege under argument yesterday.

In this case, because of that, the Minister of National Health and Welfare was given the floor today on a question of privilege, as is always the case when remarks made by a minister or by a member of the House have been quoted in the press and misinterpreted. The minister or the member is