

Oral Questions

PUBLIC SERVICE

REQUEST FOR COMPENSATION FOR EMPLOYEES WORKING IN BOTH OFFICIAL LANGUAGES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43 and seconded by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), I move:

That this House notes that the statement on bilingualism made yesterday by the Secretary of State included nothing to implement the commitment made to federal public servants that by the end of June there would be an announcement concerning adequate compensation for those who work in both official languages, and this House therefore calls on the President of the Treasury Board to keep the government's commitment and make such an announcement not later than June 30, so that this important issue can be resolved without delay.

Mr. Speaker: Under the provisions of Standing Order 43 unanimous consent of the House is required for the presentation of such a motion for debate. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO BREAK-IN AT L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE AND MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The Leader of the Opposition has moved a motion under Standing Order 43 setting out specific terms for an inquiry into the Montreal break-in at l'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec and related incidents. Given the legislative timetable, the mood of this House and the consensus emerging in the House, does the Prime Minister not think it in the best interests of parliament and the government to call for such an inquiry?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacKay: That is very interesting because on June 15, 1976 at page 14500 of *Hansard* during the capital punishment debate the Prime Minister said:

It is essential that people have confidence in the law, essential that they have confidence in the ability of the legal process to protect them against the lawless.

I am certain the Prime Minister remembers this quote. Consistent with this statement and the concern expressed by Commissioner Nadon in St. John's yesterday will the Prime Minister not reconsider his approach and have assessed the degree of ministerial and administrative responsibility which is becoming increasingly obvious in this affair and not leave the whole brunt of it to the RCMP as far as accepting blame is concerned.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the intention is not to have the RCMP bear the brunt of the blame. I think that is the effect of the questions of hon. members opposite in the last few days. If the hon. member wants to blame the government he was invited yesterday by the former Solicitor General to make a specific charge against him.

Mr. MacKay: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister takes this doctrine that every time the opposition has to blame the government—and goodness knows there is enough to blame them for—they have to make a specific charge. He is introducing a new doctrine. I want to remind the Prime Minister of another statement he made. I am sure he appreciates being reminded of his deathless quotes. On February 7 this year at page 2777 of *Hansard* the Prime Minister said:

I do not think the people suspect the RCMP of conducting themselves as the FBI do.

I share his hope and his conviction but is he prepared to help assess some of the political responsibility for this whole unsavoury mess which it is becoming increasingly evident is not an isolated incident and is directly attributable to the incompetence of a succession of Solicitors General? Will the Prime Minister not reconsider and tell the House clearly and unequivocally how he can abandon the responsibility for the federal police force on a matter of national security to a provincial inquiry?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member pinpoints the issue to one of political responsibility. If that is the case surely this is the place, the House of Commons, where political responsibility should be debated, as it was at great length last night, I understand.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: And with great effect. There are lots of sombre faces on the government side.

BREAK-IN AT PRAXIS CORPORATION—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY MEMBER

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. As the House knows, I met with him on Monday to lay before him certain information relating to the extra-parliamentary opposition concept and the related break-in and fire at Praxis Corporation in Toronto. I expressed the hope to the Solicitor General at that time that he would be in a position today to assess the validity of the information I gave him, to tell the House today in general terms what he has done about it, and what the results of his investigation so far have been.

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday during the question period the hon. member met me and gave me some information which he believes tends to indicate the occurrence of an illegal break-in at the premises of Praxis Corporation in Toronto. I have directed my officials to bring all the information brought to my attention to the attention of the attorney general of the