

PLACING OF BOMB BY CONSTABLE SAMSON—REQUEST FOR
REPORT ON INVESTIGATION

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the minister well knows, the question directed to him was whether an investigation took place concerning those very serious charges by his predecessor, the present Minister of Supply and Services. That is very apropos of what we are dealing with in the House today in view of the minister's statement that these things are rare and almost never happen. My supplementary question is this. Officer Samson was convicted of illegally placing a bomb, a very serious charge. I am sure that the Solicitor General or his predecessor has now had ample opportunity to study that case because that is what initiated the investigation into the break-in. My question is this. Who was it in the RCMP, if anybody, who authorized that activity by Samson? Was he acting as an individual, and has the Solicitor General completed an inquiry into that particular terrorist act?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, what I indicated in my statement was that the government was assured by the commissioner of the RCMP that the incident with L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec was indeed an exceptional and isolated incident. As to the incident referred to by the hon. member concerning Samson, that matter was handled exclusively in the courts by the attorney general of the province of Quebec. The individual was brought to trial and I believe that the transcript of the trial would provide answers for the hon. member. It is quite possible that nobody has ever found out who authorized it. What is quite clear and certain is that the whole matter was investigated by the attorney general of the province of Quebec and the matter brought to trial. I am not too sure how many investigations hon. members would like to see carried out.

* * *

BILINGUALISM

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF STATEMENT ON FREEDOM OF
CHOICE OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGE FOR EDUCATION

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State of which notice has been given. On page 70 of the document "A National Understanding" there is the statement: "The federal government accepts that circumstances may make necessary deferment of the application of this important principle". I want to ask the minister what the principle is. Will he clarify the policy implications of the statement so that the objective of ensuring equal rights and dignity for the French and English communities in Canada can be realized? I think the minister will agree there is some unrest about the implications of this statement.

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. gentleman and I am therefore grateful to have the chance to answer the question. There has indeed been some confusion which appears to have been caused by this paragraph. Some have even interpreted the official language

Oral Questions

policy which I presented to the House as supporting or being capable of supporting bill No. 1 of the province of Quebec. That is entirely not true, for the very fact that bill No. 1 of the province of Quebec contemplates restrictions on freedom of choice as a permanent feature in the Quebec educational system. It is the essential principle of the language paper which the federal government has presented that there should not be restrictions on freedom of choice regarding access by Canadians to either French language education or English language education.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has pointed out, to what does this possibility of deferment to be found on page 70 in the statement that "The federal government accepts that circumstances may make necessary deferment of the application of this important principle", refer?

An hon. Member: No speech.

Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but this is a very important point and I will not take much longer. I am answering the hon. member's question specifically. That statement refers to the paragraph which precedes, that is, to the possibility of some deferment in relation to immigrants arriving within the province of Quebec. It does not refer to English speaking Quebecers. Nor does it refer to Canadians who might come into the province of Quebec from outside and wish access to English speaking education.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

BREAK-IN AT L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE—REASON FOR
FAILURE TO INTERVIEW ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER L. R.
PARENT

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General and it also relates to the L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec incident. Can the Solicitor General tell the House whether he has interviewed former assistant commissioner L. R. Parent, who was the deputy director of security intelligence reporting to Mr. Starnes at the time of the break-in and who sent the letter to the former solicitor general requesting that no acknowledgement be made to the L'Agence de Presse Libre letter alleging RCMP involvement in the break-in, and who has since left the force, to determine whether or not he knew of the force's participation in the illegal break-in and, if so, why he did not give that information to the Solicitor General in his letter? If the minister has not interviewed Mr. Parent, why has he not done so?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's specific question why I have not interviewed Mr. Parent, it seems quite clear to me that since the matter was brought directly to the attention of the solicitor general at the time and that he, himself, during the course of meeting with the force, as indicated in my statement and as indicated in his statement, asked the force directly why no