

RCMP decided to look into some other contracts. They discovered certain facts which were not known by anyone at that time. At no time was I informed by the RCMP or the Attorney General that any civil servant was accused or charged with anything in this matter. I personally have made no inquiry in order to find out if there was a civil servant involved. I think that it is not my job.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: My supplementary is for the Prime Minister since the Minister of Justice is not in the House. In view of the remarks made here this afternoon by the Minister of Transport, why is the government, in defence of a suit for payment by this dredging company, counterclaiming that the deposit being withheld is not owing because the dredging company before the bid was privy to information in the Department of Transport as to what its estimates were? As we charged, in connection with the minister's statements, the successful bid was exactly what the department was estimating, and the government is now apparently defending itself against the claim on that basis.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not want to unduly restrict the questioning on this very important subject, but it is a clear rule that matters before the courts ought not to be raised in the House, and the question which indicates that the government is defending itself upon those grounds before the court at this very moment, certainly makes it clear that the questions are directed very pointedly at an issue which is before the courts. There may have been questions to which there might have been some desire to give an answer, but the matter certainly appears to be before the courts.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, with respect, the question of collusion is not before the courts, and the question as to what transpired since the minister made his statement in the House on May 13 is not before the Courts. In the light of these new developments if the Prime Minister cannot answer, we will pursue the matter on another day.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, on May 13 I just told the truth, and that is all. The police are doing their job and doing research. They are not in contact with me, but they are in contact with the Crown attorney. This case is discussed between them and this is where you are going to get your answer.

Mr. Nowlan: The counterclaim isn't the place.

Mr. Stanfield: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that the Minister of Transport is being quite honest when he says he does not know what is going on. We will have to try to find out who does know what is going on.

DREDGING CONTRACT FOR NORTH TRAVERSE—INQUIRY
WHETHER ENGINEERING CERTIFICATES ON WHICH
QUANTITIES DREDGED WERE PAID FOR WERE ASSESSED

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is for the Minister of Transport. In evaluating this contract and the payment of the amount of

Oral Questions

some \$20,860,000, would the minister inform the House if an assessment was made of the engineering certificates on which the quantities dredged were paid for. Was this undertaken by him or any officials in his department?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will consider this matter and answer later on.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGED NARCOTICS SMUGGLING RING AT MONTREAL
AIRPORT—POSSIBLE EXISTENCE OF INTERNAL REPORT

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Solicitor General. Yesterday the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby asked about an alleged internal report dealing with a big narcotic smuggling ring at the Montreal airport involving some 60 people working at the airport. Can the minister now tell the House whether such a report exists, when it was made and whether it was brought to the attention of the Minister of National Revenue and the Minister of Transport, whose departments' employees were allegedly involved?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was no question about a report. I was asked whether I had given an authorization or whether the commissioner had given an authorization to a member of the RCMP to make certain statements about a police investigation, but there was no question about a report. As far as I know there was no such report. I did not state yesterday that I would look into such a thing. If the hon. member wishes, I could look into that, but I do not know of any, and I did discuss this case at great length with the commissioner of the RCMP yesterday afternoon.

REASON REPORT CONCERNING ALLEGED NARCOTICS
SMUGGLING RING IN MONTREAL NOT BROUGHT TO
ATTENTION OF MINISTER

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): When the minister is looking into this matter will he also be prepared to give some explanation to the House as to why the contents of this report or its subject matter involving a highly important matter were apparently not called to his attention until the story was given to a *Globe and Mail* reporter and made public by that newspaper?

● (1420)

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, as far as I know there is no such report. There was an investigation. I do not know what report the hon. member is talking about. As a matter of fact, there was not even an allegation that there was such a report until right now. I should point out to the House that it is not usual for the RCMP to discuss every investigation that is going on with me; there are thousands going on in the country at any one time. If a matter is raised in committee or the House of Commons, of course I approach the RCMP for information or if an investigation is at such a level that questions might be asked I would be informed; but I was not