

*Privilege—Mr. Jarvis*

**Mr. Speaker:** If that is not the case, perhaps upon reflection there is some explanation for her choice of language, and the hon. member might want to withdraw that.

**Mrs. Holt:** Mr. Speaker, I would rather listen to your instructions than those of hon. members opposite. I apologize. I withdraw that statement.

● (1622)

I do say this, Mr. Speaker, that if it was the corner grocery man who had been involved in an incident of possession of something that did not belong to him, he might have suffered different consequences than a member of parliament.

I would like to say too that I am concerned with what has been happening in this House, with the backdrop of long experience as an observer of crime and the extent of crime in society. We are in a third world war, gentlemen. You have no ladies over there. We are in a third world war of terror. I have done research in terror and because of that happen to know things that I do not bring into the House of Commons that are secret and to which I am privy. I know certain things have been happening in the last year. International terrorists today have billions of dollars, more than any state or nation has. The thin blue line between the police—you cannot take it, you men opposite, can you?

It is a tragedy that the members of parliament over there cannot stand a little bit of other information besides their rhetoric. I tell you that I know that terrorism was a possibility and the thin blue line of protection by the police between the public and the terrorists entering Canada—

**An hon. Member:** You are embarrassing your colleagues.

**Mrs. Holt:** I would not have embarrassed my colleagues if you people could stop howling. I notice that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) called in the gentleman from Crowfoot when they disagreed with him publicly. He called in the hon. member for Saint Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) when he insulted him. He called in the former member from Burnaby-Richmond-Delta. But when something as serious as this happened, he did not have the strength, the intestinal fortitude to call in the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Cossitt).

I am deeply concerned, Mr. Speaker, with one thing in this House. I know the importance of the place of the police in society. I know the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and how he respects the police and the law; I know that the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Williams) has great respect for the police and the law. I am not sure of one or two others who have spoken, because I do not know them as well, but I do know, Mr. Speaker, that the thin blue line is so fragile—that line provided by the police for the safety of our society is fragile.

Contempt for the protection of the people, Mr. Speaker, is just frightening to anyone who cares. I just ask, and I plead in this House for the safety of the people of Canada, I ask members not to play with the information, the secret information the police may have. I have often investigated cases where

[Mr. Speaker.]

my information, if published, would have destroyed the investigation. I see it happening here on the largest possible scale. I beg you, Mr. Speaker, and I beg the responsible members opposite to please think of our country and our people, and the safety that the police provide for this country. Perhaps there is sensitive information, and perhaps the way the Solicitor General (Mr. Blais) handled this crucial situation has not satisfied some people, but let us not be ready to destroy our police force unless we have a substitute.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Perth-Wilmot (Mr. Jarvis) initiated this discussion by referring to a question of privilege on the refusal today of the Solicitor General (Mr. Blais), to answer questions on the grounds of security. He referred back, as did other hon. members, to the motions that remain outstanding as a result of earlier discussions.

I want to reiterate that my intention in dealing with those earlier motions on that occasion was to stand them out of respect for the substantive nature and the importance of the motions. I feel I made it clear at that time that no obligation exists. I think it is well understood that it is impossible to enforce an obligation to give answers during the course of a question period. However, it was a separate question at that time which related to the declared intention on the part of the hon. minister in terms of certain kinds of questions and, therefore, I felt that the most effective way to get at the answer to that question was not to send the matter to the committee, but really to see what would happen in the question period.

I have heard all of the argument today. I will give the matter further consideration and attempt to finalize those motions as soon as possible.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Second Report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications—Mr. Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul).

Second Report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry—Mr. McIsaac.

Third Report of the Standing Committee on Management and Members' Services—Mr. Coates.

[Editor's Note: For texts of above reports see today's Votes and Proceedings.]