

Inquiries of the Ministry

spilled over into this part of the year with a session which normally should have ended in June. This is because the government, of course, is not able to allot time in a definitive way. My answer to the hon. member, much as it was to the other hon. member the other day, is that if the opposition will help us try to set a reasonable time for debate on each piece of legislation or policy which was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, we will guarantee to cover all subjects.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: In light of the lengthy answer and because of the seriousness of the matter, would the Prime Minister now advise the House and country why Mr. Donald Wall, assistant secretary to the cabinet, I believe, and Mr. Donald Bevis, who I believe was secretary to the security panel or cabinet committee, were relieved of their responsibilities recently on matters connected with security and why, if not, they are not forming part of Colonel Bourne's "headless" group?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of internal organization of the government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: The question really does not make sense to me. I will try to answer, if I can read into the mind of the hon. member. It is as though he were asking me why a lawyer who is working with the Department of External Affairs did not stay in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Mr. Wall and Mr. Bevis have their duties in respect of cabinet matters and Colonel Bourne's group has its duties in regard to the Solicitor General's office. The answer is as simple as that.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I ask one further question. Perhaps it will clear the air. Were these two men not removed from office because the government had over-reacted with the War Measures Act last fall? Is that not one reason?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether that question as asked is in order.

Mr. Nielsen: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That supplementary question was not in order. I will allow the hon. member for Yukon to ask a supplementary to the first question.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, in view of the far-reaching importance of the royal commission's report on security and in view of the fact that in April, 1970, the Prime Minister gave his undertaking to the House to set aside a full day for a debate on that report, will he not reconsider and set aside that day at this time?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, if the opposition House leaders will sit down with the government House leader and arrive at a sensible schedule for the next months—

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That means sensible for the Prime Minister.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. Trudeau: —to dispose of the measures which are before the House, including the one that the hon. member just mentioned, then we will be very grateful. We believe that all these measures should be decided either positively or negatively after a reasonable period of debate. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the allegations in the previous question by the hon. member for Calgary North are completely false.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Twice the Prime Minister has made suggestions or pointed insinuations as to the extent to which the opposition may be at fault in regard to the proceedings of the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: I want to point out that there has been between the House leaders, save only when the Prime Minister has unnecessarily intervened, a fair amount of co-operation, and that it is the disastrous disorganization of the government that has been responsible for any wasted time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Selkirk.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member seeks the floor on a question of privilege. He will recognize that as a result of questions of privilege raised yesterday we got into some difficulties. The Chair takes its share of the responsibility in this respect. We missed out on a number of questions yesterday which I am sure would have been of interest to all hon. members. I trust we will not spend too much time today on questions of privilege or order, or disorder.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege is very simple. When the Prime Minister was answering the question put to him by the hon. member for Yukon, he gratuitously said that my allegations were false. I made no allegations. I merely asked the Prime Minister for information which he has and nobody else has. He refused to answer the question or to set a day for the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, on the same question of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the Prime Minister that it would not be the same question of privilege because I do not think there is a question of privilege at all. I respectfully suggest that we are really engaged in debate at this point. It might be helpful to all concerned if we went to the hon. member for Selkirk and gave him a chance to ask his question.