

RCMP did not have, which inspired the RCMP to move on the PQ?

**Hon. J.-J. Blais (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his kind words. With regard to the question he has raised, I would point out to him that the McDonald commission is dealing with the issues that he has identified. It will be my policy to leave the McDonald commission to make its own conclusions on the evidence that is adduced. I will not be commenting on a day by day basis on evidence that may be adduced before that commission on a prior occasion.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Leggatt:** Mr. Speaker, the question of political responsibility is the one that is being asked. The Solicitor General knows that. This is a blank refusal to deal with the responsibility of this government. I hope the Canadian public understand what is happening when the Solicitor General gives that kind of answer. My supplementary question is this: Also before that inquiry, evidence was given that, in fact, when the Japanese Red Army terrorist was arrested, the illegal mail openings that took place were unnecessary. The evidence was, with hindsight, they would not have needed it. The apprehension was done after a legal wiretap and had nothing whatsoever to do with the mail opening in that particular case. We had evidence by the previous solicitor general in this House, and statements by the Prime Minister, that as a direct result of that mail opening the apprehension had taken place.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder how long the hon. member really feels he is entitled to make a preamble. If he has a supplementary question, I suggest he should put it.

**Mr. Leggatt:** Mr. Speaker, you have to be careful asking questions of a new minister: I want to make sure he is fully advised. Can the Solicitor General now advise the House what information was put before the previous Solicitor General with regard to mail openings? What information was put before the Prime Minister with regard to mail openings? Was the information that the mail openings were responsible for the arrest? Was this House misled?

**Mr. Blais:** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the initial remark of the hon. member, I want to assure him that I take my ministerial responsibility very seriously indeed. That ministerial responsibility is dated as of February 1 of this year. What happened prior to that time and prior to the nomination of the previous solicitor general is a matter presently under study by the McDonald commission. The allegation the hon. member has brought to our attention is, again, a matter that was brought forward in evidence before the McDonald commission. I suggest to the hon. member that he not only rely on his interpretation of a reporter's interpretation of the evidence, but that he read the transcript. I point out to him that the transcript of Sergeant Pollock's evidence comprises 30 pages of yesterday's proceedings. I suggest he familiarize himself with those proceedings before making any sort of allegations in this

### Oral Questions

House, if he is to discharge his responsibilities as a private member.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Leggatt:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Solicitor General to clarify his last answer. Is it his position that he will not be informing himself of anything that has occurred previously in his department, in order to advise this House concerning the political responsibility of the government? Is that precisely what the minister is telling the opposition today?

**Mr. Blais:** Of course not, Mr. Speaker.

● (1132)

#### MCDONALD INQUIRY—REQUEST SOLICITOR GENERAL RECONSIDER EARLIER ANSWER

**Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Solicitor General. If we agree that we are not to rely merely on press reports of what is happening in a couple of judicial inquiries in respect of our search and our responsibility in this House to get this information, obviously this is an added burden and responsibility on us.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Lawrence:** Obviously, it is our responsibility to ask the minister these questions so that we can receive the truth in this House. Will the Solicitor General reconsider the rather inflexible attitude which he has just displayed, so that we can ask him these questions in the House about this important matter and not have to rely on what is happening in a judicial inquiry?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.-J. Blais (Solicitor General):** No, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

#### KEABLE INQUIRY—INQUIRY WHETHER NEW SOLICITOR GENERAL WILL FOLLOW POLICY OF HIS PREDECESSOR

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Solicitor General.

Can the new Solicitor General tell us whether he intends to follow the same policy as his predecessor with regard to the stand to be taken on the summons and requests of the Keable inquiry?

**Hon. J.-J. Blais (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. In fact, I had hoped that the hon. member would realize that I should analyse each summons before making a specific decision on what I am being asked. Generally speaking, I do intend to follow the policy of my predecessor with regard to such requests as I feel exceed the mandate of the Keable inquiry.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, can the minister say whether he will accept to clear up completely the reasons which led the