

2. \$146,480.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO MINISTER OF TRANSPORT

Question No. 3,963—**Mr. Murta:**

1. Is Adrian Lang, listed as Special Assistant to the Minister of Transport, related to the Minister and, if so, what is the relationship?
2. Was she appointed by Order in Council and, if so (a) on what date (b) what is her salary range and what are the details of any other remunerative consideration she is receiving (d) what are her duties?
3. How long has she been in the office of the Minister of Transport and/or the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board?
4. Has she made any trips on government business and/or government public relations and, if so (a) to what locations (b) on what dates (c) for what purpose (d) at what expense?
5. Does she have an expense account and, if so, what are all the expenses she has incurred, the purpose for each such expense and the dates incurred?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. Yes; spouse.

2. No; not applicable.

3. Since September 26, 1975.

4. (a), (b) and (c) Adrian Lang has accompanied the Minister of Transport on official trips in her capacity as Special Assistant to the Minister of Transport when deemed necessary. (d) Adrian Lang has not caused any expense to the Government of Canada in her capacity as Special Assistant to the Minister of Transport.

5. No.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 3,796 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Text]

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF SENIOR OFFICERS IN VARIOUS GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Question No. 3,796—**Mr. Orlikow:**

By department, what was the increase in the number of senior officers (a) SX1 (b) SX2 (c) SX3 (d) SX4 for each year 1969 to 1974, or in the case of new departments, commissions, agencies, etc. from their inception to 1974?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Symes: Mr. Speaker, I gave you notice today that I intended to move a motion under Standing Order 26 as it related to the national dispute of paperworkers. Due to certain developments, I request Your Honour's permission not to put that motion today but at a later time, possibly tomorrow.

Privilege—**Mr. MacKay**

PRIVILEGE

MR. MACKEY—QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS ON MATTERS SUB JUDICE

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief on this question of privilege. It is my feeling that there may be other members more senior than I who can contribute more to this debate and who will want to participate when I have finished speaking. I submit there is a plain distinction between my questions regarding tax aspects and possible police investigations with regard to Sky Shops and the specific area of the civil libel suit against myself and others brought by Thomcor Holdings Limited. If I were to be technical, there is no evidence before parliament to indicate conclusively that Thomcor Holdings are one and the same as Sky Shops.

The matter of the libel suit, of course, is civil, not criminal in nature and the Crown, not being a party, ought to be free to give information. In addition, the pleadings of the civil action in which I am involved are at such a preliminary stage that there is a question as to whether the matter is before the courts in more than a very technical sense, it has not yet been set down for trial and there is no judicial decision pending. In any event, the questions that I have asked are not part of those matters which form part of the libel suit.

A member of parliament, I submit, has a right and a duty to pursue investigations and ask questions on behalf of his constituents and the general public, and any interference or obstructions in this respect must be undertaken very carefully and supported by citations and precedents of the greatest weight and substance. Our House leader, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), will proceed to deal with the precedents and will develop the case on my behalf in greater detail. Indeed, I am so closely involved, as Your Honour pointed out, in being a participant in or party to the action that if I were to become too closely involved I might lose my sense of objectivity and be in the position that is often applied to those who act on their own behalf, that of having a fool for a client. I would not want that to happen.

I appreciate the opportunity to make these few remarks on my behalf and want to point out once more, Mr. Speaker, that the reason I originally brought this matter to your attention as a question of privilege was not because I was concerned about the litigious aspect of the matter but, rather, to give Your Honour an opportunity to make certain that the way the action was instituted against me and my co-defendants did not affect the traditional rights and privileges of Parliament and the Chair itself.

● (1510)

Mr. Speaker: I certainly want to invite contributions from other hon. members who are interested in developing the point. My interference with the hon. member in the first instance was more from the point of view of giving us an opportunity to review this question, one which is surrounded by considerable confusion. I think I have indicated that a review would show that in the particular instance of a civil law suit, the hon. member and all other hon. members are free from any restrictions. But it might be opportune, before we go further with this subject, to clari-