

statements made by counsel for the RCMP before that commission. However, there is no doubt that the commission did find fault with the RCMP in the provision of evidence to that commission.

I would prefer, however, not to comment on matters that took place in the past because of the fact, as the hon. member noted, the McDonald commission is studying these very matters and will be delivering a report on them. As I have not commented on matters coming out of the evidence before the McDonald commission, I do not think I should report or comment on matters which have come out before other commissions at this time. There will be a time for comment on such matters and I will be very forthcoming with the House when that time comes.

● (1500)

Mr. Lawrence: Madam Speaker, I am sure the Solicitor General understood that I was not talking about matters before the McDonald commission. I was talking about a very serious charge by a provincial royal commission concerning the credibility and the trustworthiness of the force as a whole and about the representations made to that provincial royal commission. Obviously the McDonald commission has not dealt with this matter because the solicitor general of the day was not brought before that commission.

Has the Solicitor General not caused some investigation into how patently untrue instructions were given to a counsel before a royal commission? Those patently untrue instructions resulted in a very serious element of misrepresentation not only by the counsel for the RCMP but also by the counsel for the commission.

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kaplan: Madam Speaker, anyone can read the Krever report. It is publicly available. When people do read it, they will see that the hon. member has misrepresented the observations made by that commission about the representations made before the commission.

When I looked into the matter, I did so to satisfy myself that the RCMP had, in one way or another and at one time or another, made all relevant information available to the Krever commission. I am satisfied from the information I have that they did that and that they eventually carried out the responsibility of all good citizens to bring information forward to royal commissions.

The comments which may be made or ought to be made about the conduct and forthrightness of the RCMP are general comments which the public will want to review and about which the public ought to be commenting, but for my part I will reserve my comments on that until the McDonald commission—which, after all, has all these matters before it—reports in due course later this year.

Oral Questions

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

STATEMENT OF MINISTER ON INACCURACY OF MINUTES OF MEETING

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the minister responsible for the status of women. On Friday Ms. Shelley-Ann Clark, the secretary of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, said that the minister lied to the House when he stated that the minutes of the January 9 meeting of the council were inaccurate. Does the minister stand by the statement he made to the House?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, if the hon. member for Oshawa had been a little more careful, he would have checked my statements in the House. I indicated solely that there was an affidavit which attested to misrepresentations.

Mr. Nielsen: Where is it? Produce it.

Mr. Axworthy: I simply referred to the affidavit. I did not comment on that because I have not seen those minutes. I do not know whether they are accurate or not, but I did say there was an affidavit which had been deposed by five members of the executive committee so attesting.

Mr. Broadbent: Madam Speaker, the credibility of the minister, who is the person responsible for the status of women in this country, is undermined every time he answers a question in the House of Commons. Has he just indicated to the House that he has not seen the affidavit and, if not, in the interests of honesty and truth on this whole subject why has he not seen it? Will he assure the House that he will have a look at it and then come back to the House, produce it and make a statement in the House as to whether he has been conveying the right information or whether the secretary of the body in question is telling the truth?

Mr. Axworthy: Madam Speaker, as I have said many times in the House, this was a matter which should really have been resolved by the parties to that dispute. Those parties are the members of the executive committee who have publicly stated that they have signed an affidavit. I gather that the secretary says that what she recorded is accurate. If there is a problem, I suggest that the two parties to that disagreement resolve it between themselves or take the proper action. All I reported to this House was that there was an affidavit signed by executive members. If the hon. member wants me to obtain a copy of that affidavit, I would be prepared to ask the members of the executive committee to produce one. I would be glad to do that, but what I said was that I had not seen a copy of the minutes. I therefore have never commented on the accuracy of the statements, only that there was an affidavit.