

**Mr. Speaker:** The presentation of such a motion for debate in the House pursuant to Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

BREAK-IN AT L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE—SUGGESTION  
MINISTER OF SUPPLY AND SERVICES RESIGN—MOTION UNDER  
S.O. 43

**Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion concerns the new theory of ministerial responsibility which, briefly put, postulates that a minister's constitutional responsibility lies with his ministerial assistants. In light of the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) use of this new prerogative in three successive scandals, namely Hamilton Harbour, the Loughheed procurement, the Larry Stopforth affair, and now the APLQ break-in, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. McKinley):

That this House, recognizing that the minister refuses ministerial responsibility for the actions of his staff and in light of the minister's press release of June, 1977 in which he stated that he would resign if he were guilty of any acts of commission or omission, direct that the minister now resign.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Noting that this motion requires unanimous consent, may I ask if there is unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It pertains directly to the motion under Standing Order 43 moved by the House leader of the Conservative party, with the sentiments of which we agree entirely.

In raising my point of order, I want to indicate that I was going to do it just prior to the opening of the question period and ask the House to consider the principle involved in the motion moved by the House leader of the Conservative party.

I understand the clear possibility that members on the government side might have said no to the motion that was moved because they might have thought it would lead directly to debate on that motion. I have no doubt that that was not the intention of the House leader of the Conservative party when he moved that motion.

With unanimous agreement, it would be possible for the present Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) to answer questions pertaining to the very important and murky affair, the break-in of a publishing house in Montreal in the fall of 1972. I appeal to the members of this House, particularly the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), to give approval to the idea that the present Minister of Supply and Services be permitted in this question period to answer very important and

*Oral Questions*

very pressing questions on this matter, precisely because there is no other forum open to us at this point.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member seeks, by way of a point of order, to make what might be a suggestion. In any case, it is not being used to draw attention to disorder in this House which is about the limit permitted under the rules at this particular juncture.

\* \* \*

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM EUROPEAN  
PARLIAMENT

**Mr. Speaker:** May I borrow just one minute from the oral question period in which to invite hon. members to join with me in recognizing the presence in our galley of a very distinguished delegation, which is here for a few days of what we are sure will be very cordial and successful exchanges as they have always been in the past—a delegation from the European parliament headed by the very distinguished British parliamentarian, Mr. James Scott Hopkins.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

BREAK-IN AT L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE—REQUEST FOR  
PUBLIC INQUIRY

**Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, before beginning, I should like to make it clear that the purpose of the intervention of the House leader for the Official Opposition by way of a motion under Standing Order 43 was not to generate a debate but to get the right to put questions to the only minister who is able to answer them.

I begin by directing a question to the Prime Minister. In the statement of the Solicitor General last Friday, a categorical statement was attributed to the former solicitor general, the present Minister of Supply and Services, that that minister was not informed that the theft of documents was the result of an unlawful entry in which the RCMP had actually participated. However, the former commissioner of the RCMP and the former director general of the RCMP security service have stated, and I quote, that "they would be surprised if they had not verbally advised the solicitor general in this regard."

There is a clear and alarming contradiction here, a situation in which the minister states he was not informed of the break-in and in which the former commissioner and director general state, as diplomatically as they can, that they would be surprised if they had not informed him. In the light of this