

really, according to what he says, is feeding the rumour mill. I feel he is doing his best to keep those rumours alive. In recent months, they have certainly been a popular topic in the newspapers.

[English]

The hon. member rightly points out that Mr. Gouzenko did in fact state that there were several other spy rings operating in Canada in addition to the one of which he was directly aware. It will be recalled that Mr. Gouzenko disclosed the existence of a spy ring operating on behalf of Soviet military intelligence, the GRU. Mr. Gouzenko claimed that there were other spy rings operating in Canada, some perhaps also under GRU direction, and still others which were under the control of the Soviet state security intelligence organization, the KGB.

This information was also disclosed in the 1946 report of the Taschereau-Kellock commission of inquiry. I might say to the hon. member that an exhibit in any report is part of the report and should be disclosed at the same time. I am just wondering why the hon. member is asking why the exhibits have not been disclosed when the report has not been.

This is not a new question, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, on May 31, 1978, as recorded in *Hansard* at pages 5920 and 5921, the Solicitor General of the day, the present Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Blais), gave a full and complete answer. I reply to a written question by the hon. member for Leeds-Grenville (Mr. Cossitt), the minister acknowledged Mr. Gouzenko's claim that there were several espionage rings operating in Canada at the time in question and that it was not true that the RCMP only pursued the investigation of one network. In reply to a request for further details, the solicitor general at the time noted that it was not the policy of the government to comment publicly on individual police and security investigations. The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich knows that, and for obvious reasons government policy is not changing.

In the second part of his question the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich makes the allegation that the RCMP investigation into these additional Soviet espionage networks was interrupted or stopped by other members of the public service. This allegation again is almost identical to the assertion referred to in the earlier question by the hon. member for Leeds-Grenville. In his question that hon. member supposed that the government had failed to act in relation to the investigation of these other groups. In fact, the solicitor general at the time advised the House that the government was satisfied that all leads flowing from Mr. Gouzenko's information had been exhaustively pursued and that no further action was required.

I wish to assure my hon. friend that all the information was given at the time and it has not changed since then.

● (2210)

THE CONSTITUTION—PROCEDURE FOR CONVENING FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCES

Mr. John Gamble (York North): Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1981, I posed two questions to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). The first one related to the application of clause 35(1)

Adjournment Debate

of the constitutional resolution which will return to this House, and it involved the requirement under that clause for the Prime Minister to call a constitutional conference consisting, in terms of those in attendance, of himself and the provincial premiers. I asked a question as to the usefulness of that particular clause, having regard to the indication of the Prime Minister that day or the day before that he did not intend to attend a meeting called by eight of the ten provincial premiers.

My concern at the time was that it is futile, very clearly, to insert a provision of this nature in the principal and fundamental law of Canada which requires for its application the good will not only of the Prime Minister of the country, but also the good will of ten provincial premiers and, presumably, in the event that the Yukon and Northwest Territories become provinces, ultimately the good will of the premiers of those areas as well. I did not believe it was appropriate that the Prime Minister attend to the request for a meeting, in the fashion he did, without recognizing the harm that he would do to the natural good will which was necessary in order that, first, the provincial premiers attend these intended conferences and, second, something indeed be accomplished thereat.

Fortunately, subsequent to April 6 the Prime Minister did indicate that he would attend such a meeting, and he went on at some length at a later date as well to point out that he hoped the good will that needed to be fostered in Canada would continue after the Supreme Court had ruled. Presumably he meant the Supreme Court would rule in his favour because it was not long after his comments that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien), as recently as the latter part of last week, indicated that in the event that the Supreme Court should determine that the autocratic position taken by the federal government is ultra vires, he will see to it that the Supreme Court is used as an instrument to extract from the provinces some of the authorities they are currently exercising.

These matters are significant, and they go to the very roots of the need in our country for government leaders in the provinces and at the federal level to deal with each other on a basis of, if not friendship, at least some form of open congeniality which will produce the well-being desired by the people of Canada. From all indications, what has transpired so far is a clear demonstration for all who have witnessed the proceedings, that this government is hardly the government to be involved in the process of establishing such a fundamental change in the nature of our country.

My supplementary question dealt with the acknowledged legal concept that in the event the charter of rights is established as contemplated by this resolution, the Supreme Court of Canada will in fact, as is the case in other jurisdictions, legislate through its interpretive judgments dealing with what the words in this charter mean. That is a simple principle of law and one which surely must be recognized by the Prime Minister who, I understand, was called to the bar, although I doubt he has ever practised. At least I do not think he has ever practised.

Instead of dealing with the issue which was raised in the question, the Prime Minister dealt with the myth that for 54