

of debate. The hon. member is debating, he does not have a question of privilege, and I have to tell him that he cannot pursue it.

MR. LAWRENCE—NATIONAL SECURITY—REMARKS OF MR. KAPLAN DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. Allan Lawrence (Durham-Northumberland): Madam Speaker, when I attempted yesterday to raise a question of privilege in respect of certain matters raised during question period and others attempted to join in, you quite wisely cautioned us all to make sure of the basis or foundation of what we were saying. I believe you cautioned us to wait until *Hansard* was available.

I have now had the opportunity of perusing *Hansard*, and if I may just draw your attention to page 10697 of yesterday's *Hansard*, the words I am complaining about were spoken by the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan). I quote the last four lines of what he said on that day:

What I would like to know is whether the leader of his party, the former prime minister, has authorized him—

That is me.

—to make these statements notwithstanding his oath of office as a privy councillor.

I merely reiterate to you, Madam Speaker, and the House that nothing I have said publicly in this context in any manner, shape or form offends any oath I have ever taken as a privy councillor.

Therefore, I think the Solicitor General has simply two courses of action open to him: he can either apologize and withdraw those words today; or I suggest to you that he must be made by you and this House to detail anything I have said publicly about this matter which was presented to me by departmental officials or any other agency of the government while I was solicitor general.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Prove it.

Mr. Lawrence: Yes, prove it.

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General): Madam Speaker, there have been a lot of so-called revelations in the House and elsewhere recently about national security operations. Some but not all have been attributed to the hon. member. Yesterday in the House he said, as reported at page 10696 of *Hansard*, that there have been, and I quote:

—what I believe to be inspired and selective leaks from within the government itself—

My officials, Madam Speaker, are entitled to be deeply indignant about this suggestion. They cannot speak for themselves here or elsewhere and it is my responsibility as their minister to do so. Therefore, as he was the minister responsible for the internal security of Canada, I ask him to come clean with me and the House and indicate if he has any grounds at all for his belief that there—

Point of Order—Mr. Rose

Madam Speaker: Order. Hon. members are continuing debate on this question. I have looked at *Hansard* very carefully and have found that none of the words recorded there would seem to impute motives to one member or another. That is quite clear to me from reading the record pertaining to that particular exchange in the House.

The minister on one side and the hon. member for Durham-Northumberland (Mr. Lawrence) on the other side did state to the House that they had made a certain statement. The hon. member for Durham-Northumberland did say to the House that he had not broken his oath, and it is the custom of the House to take the hon. member's word for that.

I think that puts an end to this particular question of privilege. There was nothing unparliamentary in the words uttered in this House or recorded in *Hansard*; therefore I must rule that matter is closed.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. MCKNIGHT—REMARKS OF MR. PEPIN RESPECTING COMPENSATION TO FARMERS

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Madam Speaker, I will be very brief. I notice that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) is not here, but I am sure that he would not want to have left the impression in answering a question I asked that the producers of rape, rye and flax would be compensated under the embargo payments when in fact the release from the Department of Agriculture states oilseeds and other grains are not covered under these payments. I am sure the minister would not want to leave the impression with the House that the producers of those grains would be compensated.

Madam Speaker: That is up to the minister, and I am sure the point of order will be noted by him.

MR. ROSE—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF RULING BY MADAM SPEAKER

Mr. Mark Rose (Mission-Port Moody): Madam Speaker, I would be grateful if you could perhaps provide the House with a clarification of the ruling on the question of privilege of the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent). Is it in line or congruent with the Speaker's ruling that a member of Parliament, moving a motion under Standing Order 43, can from now on get up and say anything, truthfully or untruthfully, make any kind of charges against another hon. member, and that once that motion has been disposed of, by unanimous consent or otherwise, there is no protection and the member has no recourse to have the record changed or demand an apology? I find that to be an incredulous ruling and I think we should do something about that rule.

Mr. D. M. Collette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, obviously I do