

House of Commons

tion. It is his responsibility to give such evidence to me or to the Solicitor General.

Mr. Forrestall: What can you provide?

Mr. Trudeau: What are you babbling about?

Mr. Forrestall: I am not babbling. You are waffling.

Mr. Trudeau: If he can provide such evidence, I can assure him and this House that an immediate and thorough investigation will be made.

The hon. member for Mackenzie also raised a question on Friday with regard to the telephones of Members of Parliament. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the telephone services of members of parliament come within your own jurisdiction. So far as the government is concerned may I say, as categorically as in the case of the question relating to private mail, that there is no policy or practice by the government or by the RCMP to interfere in any way whatsoever with the telephones of members of parliament. If any hon. member has any evidence that such a thing is occurring, I would again think it is his responsibility to provide such evidence—in this case, I assume, to you, Mr. Speaker. The government would be glad to make any investigation that such evidence would suggest to be necessary or desirable.

• (1410)

Finally, the hon. member for the Yukon asked about long distance calls of members of parliament to and from constituents. The flat denials I have just made as to policy or practice by the government or by the RCMP in relation to members' telephones apply equally to long distance calls. There is no recording of any kind of which I am aware and certainly there is no policy of the kind the hon. member has suggested.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, the reference that I made to the Acting Prime Minister while the Prime Minister was away last Friday was not merely to telephone calls to and from members' offices involving constituents but long-distance telephone calls generally. With respect to the practice I alluded to last Friday the Prime Minister has said that the RCMP have assured him that no such practice or policy exists. But he says nothing about the security policy that exists within departments and which I believe to be part of the new security arrangements of the Solicitor General (Mr. Goyer) that were implemented a short while ago.

It is all very well for the Prime Minister to stand in his place and say to an hon. member who raises such a question that it is the member's clear responsibility to advance evidence, either to himself or to other members of the government, for the purpose of investigation or remedial action. But, Sir, what would happen if that were done?

Mr. Hogarth: Better fish or cut bait.

Mr. Nielsen: I did not hear the interjection by the hon. member for New Westminster.

Mr. Hogarth: Fish or cut bait.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. Nielsen: It is all very well for members opposite and for the Prime Minister to say that it is the clear responsibility of a member to adduce evidence. However, were that to be done—

Mr. Stafford: Four years ago you said that a hundred times.

Mr. Nielsen:—were that to be done the source of information, if it were a government source, would be fired, and fired immediately, and the Prime Minister knows that. He would dearly love to know the source of the leakage of the Gray report and the source of the leakage of documents concerning the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, but if that source were to be disclosed it would mean the immediate dismissal of that civil servant.

I do not accept the Prime Minister's assurance that these practices are not being followed because my source is much too highly placed to be wrong.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Introduction of bills.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have gone beyond motions. The House gave unanimous consent to reverting to motions to permit the right hon. Prime Minister to table documents and also to make a statement. My understanding was that we were then to go on to other items of business. But again with unanimous consent, if hon. members want to revert to motions to deal with other matters I have no objection. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity.

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond on a point of order.

Mr. MacInnis: I rise on a point of order because of the interjection from the other side of the House only to say that if the House leader wants to move a motion let him do it himself.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is hardly a point of order. The House will now go on to the next item, questions on the order paper.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)