

*Oral Questions***ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE****BREAK-IN AT PARTI QUÉBÉCOIS OFFICES—GOVERNMENT  
REFUSAL TO PROVIDE DOCUMENTS TO INQUIRY**

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I regret the absence of the Solicitor General. I checked with his office this morning and was told that he would be in for question period. He has obviously changed his mind. I will put my question to the Prime Minister. Since RCMP staff-sergeant François d'Entremont, of the Montreal detachment, asked RCMP headquarters, by telex on December 23, 1972, for confirmation that the break-in which took place on January 9, 1973, to obtain information about the Parti Québécois was legal, as the staff sergeant sent the request by telex to Ottawa to find out, before involving himself, whether he was about to do something legal or illegal, and since the reply he received authorized him to take what has turned out to be, transparently, an illegal act, could the Prime Minister tell the House why the government has refused the Keable inquiry access to the reply sent from Ottawa?

● (1422)

Surely, the reply was other than a straightforward "yes" or "no" and contained important information that I, for one, cannot believe would have any security implications.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General has been detained on a personal matter, and I regret his absence from the House at this time. I will gladly take notice of that question and make sure he provides an answer.

**ALLEGED ILLEGAL ACTIONS OF FORCE—MINISTERIAL  
RESPONSIBILITY**

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is also directed to the Prime Minister and concerns the notion of ministerial responsibility. In view of the fact that Superintendent Nowlan of the RCMP, the man who conducted the internal inquiry established last June into wrongdoings of the RCMP, was personally and deeply implicated in the illegal break-in to obtain information about the Parti Québécois in January, 1973, and since the Solicitor General indicated he was not told until late last fall about this activity, is it not the Prime Minister's view of ministerial responsibility that such a person should be sacked from his position if, in fact, he did not provide the Solicitor General with the information he requested last June?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, this appears to me to be the type of argument the hon. member should make sure is familiar to the McDonald commission. I think this is a pleading of responsibility. We set up the McDonald royal commission precisely to look into the matter of responsibility of the RCMP and the government, and we are anxiously awaiting its report.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Prime Minister, as the head of the government, what I think is an

[Mr. Basford.]

important question on the principle of ministerial responsibility. Is it not his view that if a senior official of the Solicitor General's Department, or of any other department, is requested to conduct an inquiry and systematically misleads the minister in terms of the report he makes, that person should be dismissed or other, equally severe punitive action should be taken? Is that not at least what ministerial responsibility is all about?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, there is an allegation contained in that question that an RCMP officer systematically misled his minister.

**Mr. Broadbent:** I said, if that is the case.

**Mr. Trudeau:** The member is asking a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker. I am telling him that the responsibility of the McDonald commission is to look into the facts to see if there was any systematic misleading.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Three years from now? The minister will be back tomorrow.

**Mr. Trudeau:** It is our opinion that there was no illegal or improper conduct on the part of RCMP officials. But we are trying to satisfy ourselves, through the royal commission, whether or not this is the fact; that is why we are waiting for its report.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**AGRICULTURE****INQUIRY WHETHER BEEF WILL BE MARKETED IN SAME  
FASHION AS OTHER FOOD PRODUCTS**

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Further to the report of the commission of inquiry into the marketing of beef and veal in Canada, has the minister determined or is he in the process of determining what steps can be taken to implement the recommendations of the commission, and does he also intend to act upon the amendment to Bill C-76, allowing beef to be marketed on the same basis as the other foods covered by that act?

[English]

**Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I can say to the hon. member that approximately 50 per cent to 60 per cent of the recommendations of the beef commission, and the Senate committee which studied the beef marketing system in Canada, have been or are in the process of being implemented. Also, some of the others are about to be put into place. The legislation suggested by both the Senate committee and the beef commission will be presented to the House in the near future. Work is being done on this legislation at the present time. With regard to the suggestion that we amend Bill C-76, there is no intention of doing that unless the beef producers ask for it.