

of Commons recently and the subject matter of a Toronto *Sun* story listing 16 subversive activities carried on in Canada. Is the Solicitor General now able to confirm that this classified material emanated, not from the RCMP but from one or more of the 58 government employees or offices who are recipients of this classified material?

**Hon. J.-J. Blais (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman perhaps noted from comments I made relating to this matter outside the House—and there were no questions relating to it yesterday in the House—it has not been our practice, and it is not my practice, to comment on the nature of such information.

**An hon. Member:** Why?

**Mr. Jarvis:** Mr. Speaker, because of his silence, the Solicitor General permits the festering of suspicion about a serious security leak in the RCMP. Is it accurate to say that the 58 copies of the report, or its précis, were distributed by or under the authority of the Intelligence Advisory Committee? This is not an RCMP committee, but is composed of representatives of various federal departments, including the Solicitor General's department, I believe the Department of Justice, National Defence, the Privy Council office, and there may be others. Was it that authority which authorized the distribution of the 58 copies?

● (1427)

**Mr. Blais:** Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. member's question is of the nature of the previous question. Therefore, my reply is the same.

**Mr. Jarvis:** A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister said clearly last Thursday that the security of this country was in peril and was vulnerable because contained in this report, allegedly, was the source of information, the names of informants, the methods of operation, and so on. I would like to ask the Solicitor General, if that report was such a challenge to our national security, why would 58 copies be produced and circulated among various government departments?

**Mr. Blais:** Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making certain allegations and I am not going to comment on those allegations.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INQUIRY WHETHER AMENDMENTS TO BANK ACT HAVE BEEN DRAFTED

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Finance inform the House whether he has received from the Department of Justice the bill amending the Bank Act and, if not, when did he send that bill to the

#### Oral Questions

Department of Justice for the drafting of amendments as he indicated to us a few days ago?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, the answer is no to the first part of the question. I have not yet received this bill. Concerning the second part of his question, I would say to the hon. member that communications between my department, the general director of banks and the Department of Justice began last fall and that I do not have the precise date of those discussions.

**Mr. Lambert:** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary.

Could the minister tell the House when cabinet developed the principles on which the amendments would be based, when they were submitted to the Department of Justice and when they will be sent back?

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot discuss in the House the specific dates for those decisions. I can merely tell the hon. member that the Department of Justice has been working for a very long time on that review of the Bank Act. There have been many consultations between my department and the Department of Justice in that regard. Many times, some items have been reexamined by cabinet, as it happens regularly. But the hon. gentleman being a former cabinet member, he should know very well that I am not at liberty to give any more details.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

RIGHT OF AGGRIEVED PERSONS TO CALL WITNESSES BEFORE BOARD OF REFEREES

**Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Is the minister prepared to overrule the decision of the UIC re the case of Robert Richardson, of North Bay, who was denied natural justice and labelled a fraud? This matter was raised by the CBC ombudsman last Sunday, who presented evidence to support the position that this man was denied the right to have witnesses testify on his behalf. If so, will the minister take steps to reimburse Mr. Richardson and compensate him for the damage done to his good reputation?

**Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, it was determined by our officials that Mr. Richardson was working. While he took his appeal to the Board of Referees, which is comprised of labour, management and government representatives, the decision was unanimous that he was working at the time he was drawing unemployment insurance. He made application for an appeal and that was turned down by the chairman. The penalty for fraud was removed, however, as a result of the investigation, not because of the work by the ombudsman of the CBC but because of the work we did which indicated that, in my view and in the view