Mr. Speaker: It is a suggestion which calls into question, perhaps the interests that were expressed in the circumstances. It is not in any way an offence of any law or regulation of which I am aware. Therefore, on the basis of recent precedents, I find that no question of privilege exists.

MR. BROADBENT—ALLEGED RCMP BREAK-IN—PRIME MINISTER'S ANSWERS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a question of privilege, and the ruling you have just made I find rather encouraging. The question of privilege on which I rise pertains to answers given in the House this afternoon by the Prime Minister. Those of us in the House have grown, during the past month, clearly aware of just how this authoritarian master of the half-truth has handled the RCMP, security and ministerial responsibility issues. However, today I submit he overstepped the bounds of the rules of this House and was involved in what we euphemistically call here a misleading of the House—not only once, but twice.

An hon. Member: Was it deliberate?

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the first instance was in reply to a question I asked, in respect of which he made a totally irresponsible allegation that I had at any time said that the RCMP was involved in a break-in of the headquarters of the New Democratic Party here in Ottawa. That was the allegation the Prime Minister made. At no time, Mr. Speaker, either inside the House of Commons or outside, have I ever made such an allegation. My colleague, the hon. member for Greenwood, did move the following motion in the House on November 1:

> That in the light of the fact that the federal office of the New Democratic Party was broken into on December 3, 1972, the government be directed to institute full inquiries into the searching or breaking into the property of any political party in Canada.

I know the Prime Minister has a vivid imagination, Mr. Speaker, but it would take one equal to his imaginative capacities to distort that into the suggestion that I had alleged the RCMP was involved in a break-in at our headquarters. That motion, I repeat, was moved by the hon. member for Greenwood. I had nothing to do with it—and the motion itself, of course, makes no such allegation. Any questions that have been raised on this matter, as the Prime Minister well knows, have always been in the form of questions, and not accusations, in any case. I submit that the Prime Minister, as I said, to use a euphemism that we are familiar with in the House, has misled the House by claiming that I made the allegation that the RCMP did, indeed, break into the headquarters of our political party here in Ottawa.

The second bit of misinformation came from the Prime Minister in response to a question I put to him as to whether or not he was considering at the time that it was proper he should exercise his prime ministerial responsibilities—he does that from time to time—when he discovered in 1974 and 1975 that the RCMP was involved in illegally obtaining information about the Parti Québécois, making inquiries as to whether the RCMP was involved in a systematic surveillance of any other political party. His reply to me today was, "Frankly, no."

The implication—and that is as far as it goes—was that he knew the answer, that there was not any surveillance of any other political party. He said the following on November 2 in the House, in response to a question put to him by another member, the hon. member for Perth-Wilmot, who was making inquiries about the same subject matter, that is, whether or not other political parties had been the subject of unwanted RCMP intrusions, as recorded at page 561 of *Hansard:*

> —I know of no surveillance exercise of any political party as such, only the one I referred to in the case of the Parti Québécois and I had it stopped as soon as I learned about it.

In that answer he is saying he had no knowledge, or to his knowledge there was not any surveillance of any other political party. Today, in reply to my question as to whether he had made such inquiries of any other parties involved, he said, "Frankly, no"—he had never done it. He may get out of that aspect of my question of privilege by saying he did not put the question. But when he was answering on November 2, even though he left the impression with the House that he had not made inquiries, he never explicitly said that. That comes back to a half-truth, and therefore perhaps I would not have a question of privilege on that.

I repeat that on the first part I do have a question of privilege. He said that I had said something which I had never said either inside the House or outside it. If you rule I have a *prima facie* question of privilege, I will move that this matter be referred to the committee on privileges and elections.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the second point raised by the leader of the New Democratic Party can be dismissed out of hand. Any reasonable reader would just say that the leader of the New Democratic Party was trying to interpret what I said, which is not substantiated by the texts. I do not believe I have to get into it any further. I answered then, as I answered today, to the best of my knowledge when I said that I knew of no surveillance. That is what it meant; I knew of no surveillance. The leader of the New Democratic Party admits that maybe that one is not very strong, in that sense.

He does put more attention on the first point that was raised today about the alleged RCMP break-in of the offices of the New Democratic Party. Mr. Speaker, I can understand that the New Democratic Party is now trying to back away from the position it has put itself in over the past few weeks. I believe the leader of the NDP met some of his people in Saskatchewan, I believe it is, over the weekend and has discovered that the position of his party in making all these hysterical allegations about the RCMP is not supported among them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada or, indeed, members of this party are not concerned with illegalities or illegal activities by some RCMP