

Nations, and I will advise the Hon. Member of the consequences of that action.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Mount Royal.

Mrs. Finestone: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I thought you had said I had only one question.

The Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs answered in the same way on June 9 and subsequently in a letter on December 29, so I remind him that I have been waiting for almost one year for his response.

INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister what has happened with the allegations in respect of Kurt Waldheim and the study which was to be initiated with other countries in respect of that dossier. Could he give us an update on that now?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in light of the Hon. Member's preface to her second question, I am tempted to say that I have only one answer.

The answer is as I gave it. We are conducting inquiries. We have been in touch with officials of the United Nations. We are in touch with officials of other countries. As she would know, because she has shown a steady interest in this question, her question would require a more detailed reply which I do not have at hand at the moment. However, I will get it into my hands and then into hers.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last question.

* * *

WESTERN GRAIN STABILIZATION ACT

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT TO PERMIT EASIER ACCESS BY FARMERS

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for the Canadian Wheat Board who earlier in Question Period noted that the Western Grain Stabilization Fund is in deficit. The Minister knows that some 17 per cent or 18 per cent of producers are still outside the Western Grain Stabilization Plan.

In view of the fact that future payments will have to come out of future government and producer levies, will the Minister consider at this time opening up the Act to provide for easier and more facilitated access for those farmers who are presently outside the purview of the plan but would like to get in at this time?

Hon. Charles Mayer (Minister of State (Canadian Wheat Board)): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member raises a matter of pretty significant consequences to those producers who are not part of the program, especially in view of the record pay-outs.

Privilege—Mr. Holtmann

We have had representations similar to the ones raised by the Hon. Member. I will certainly look at that representation. I also tell the Hon. Member that we have done some work on how we might open up the plan to bring everybody into it, in line with the import of the question which he raised.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED DIVULGING OF *IN CAMERA* COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Mr. Felix Holtmann (Selkirk—Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I should like to begin by referring to the Nineteenth Edition of Erskine May at page 146 of Chapter X—Breaches of Privileges and Contempts. In part it reads:

That the evidence taken by any select committee of this House, and the documents presented to such committee, and which have not been reported to the House, ought not to be published by any member of such committee or by any other person.

It goes on to say:

Where the public are admitted this rule is usually not enforced. The publication or disclosure of proceedings of committees conducted with closed doors or of draft reports of committees before they have been reported to the House will, however, constitute a breach of privilege or a contempt.

It is on the basis of the third report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, which was presented to the House today, indicating the actions of a member of the committee, the Hon. Member for Kenora—Rainy River (Mr. Parry), that I believe my privileges have been breached.

This morning the report indicated that the Hon. Member for Kenora—Rainy River in fact divulged a good deal of information arising from an *in camera* session in which I participated. He did it without considering the ramifications of such an action.

I should like to refer to exactly what he said on March 25, 1987, the day following the *in camera* session, as reported at page 4540 of *Hansard*:

—when Canadians elect representatives to speak for their concerns in Ottawa, they do so in the hope that, when appropriate, all Parties will work toward constructive ends. As the spokesman on aboriginal issues for the New Democratic Party, I have and continue to hold the view that partisan concerns and parochial attitudes do nothing to further the cause of Canada's first people.

Those were his words. When speaking of the *in camera* session he said:

Yesterday the Indian, Inuit and Métis people of Canada were reminded again of that truism. In an anonymous office tower, behind closed doors and safely tucked away from probing microphones, four Members of Parliament abrogated their responsibilities to aboriginal people—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) on a point of order.