

any information he does have also to the provincial attorneys general for the purpose of analysis as to whether the people who were breaking the law, whether they be in the police force or average citizens, will face prosecution according to the evidence before the attorneys general.

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member on the other side is really serious when he says he does not want this matter to drag out in a piecemeal fashion day after day in this House, I suggest to him that he let the royal commission of inquiry do its job and let us get on with the business of the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You should come clean.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

BOMBING AT CUBAN TRADE MISSION MONTREAL—ALLEGATION GOVERNMENT ACTED TO FREE FIVE MEN CHARGED

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, in a news story in the *Toronto Sun* today details of a bombing incident at the Cuban Trade Mission in 1972 are related. It states that two bombs were exploded, and that firemen and police were confronted with Cubans, many of whom were armed with machine guns. Will the minister confirm that the six Cubans who were initially charged with unlawfully having guns were freed of these charges by the Quebec authorities after the federal government intervened?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's story goes back to 1962, as I understand it.

Mr. Kempling: 1972.

Mr. Fox: 1972; that is five years ago, so perhaps he will allow me 25 hours to check it out.

● (1512)

Mr. Kempling: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Solicitor General. In checking this out, and if the government is as concerned as it claims to be with terrorists and subversive elements, will the hon. Minister explain why the federal government intervened to have the charges dropped and why it subsequently apologized to the Cuban government for charging six nationals who were armed with machine guns and who had obviously violated our laws?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is making a point along the lines that I have been trying to make for a number of days in this House. If there are people going around with machine guns in this country, they ought to be the object of surveillance.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kempling: Why did you let them off?

Mr. Gillies: Why did you let them go?

Questions of Privilege

PRIVILEGE

DEFERRAL OF RULING BY MR. SPEAKER ON OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS

Mr. Speaker: There are two outstanding questions of privilege, one raised by the hon. member for Peace River which relates to some remarks made by the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the course to be followed, depending on the outcome of those arguments—which I have now considered very carefully—is that the member who is alleged to have made offensive remarks may have several courses of action to take, it is in keeping with the practices of the House always to ensure that the hon. member is present when the decision is made; therefore, I would prefer to withhold that decision until Monday.

There is another decision outstanding from yesterday. The hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare raised, by way of a question of privilege, some disagreement with interpretations of the press and other members about remarks she made outside the House. That matter was disposed of by the Chair. However, a second question of privilege on the same general subject was raised by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. At the time, it seemed to me it had two difficulties which I indicated yesterday. The first was that disagreement between one minister and another, or contradictory statements made by a minister—or, in fact, by any member—does not give rise to a question of privilege. The second was that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton intended to propose a motion relating to the grievance of another member, which also posed a procedural difficulty.

I undertook to examine the precedents to see whether I was correct in those assessments. I do not propose to elaborate on them, but want to reaffirm my initial impression that alleged contradictory statements by one member or another, or by one minister or another, do not in any circumstance constitute a question of privilege. The most recent ruling on that matter appears in the *Journals* of November 16, 1971, at page 923. The second is in respect of an attempt by one member to move to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections that which has been raised by way of a grievance of another member. It is an extraordinary procedure which was attempted recently, on June 21, 1977, by the right hon. member for Prince Albert, and I took occasion to disagree with that practice at that time. That can be found at page 6916 of *Hansard*. Therefore, I would reaffirm the disposition of yesterday and simply refer hon. members to those precedents.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, on the question Your Honour raised concerning the question of privilege in which I was involved, I should like to point out that I will not be in this chamber on Monday or Tuesday of next week.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: I will be going around the country trying to tell Canadians what this government is doing. I remember the ruling Your Honour made just the other day. If it should be