

RCMP

Mr. Clark: In light of the most recent allegations made tonight, we want to know whether federal security officers infiltrated the so-called Common Front of Quebec labour unions in 1971 and stole documents on that organization's bargaining position and strategy, documents which were subsequently turned over to the government of Quebec. If that was the case, we want to know on whose authority, and if ministers claim they did not know, we want to know why they did not know.

We want to know if security officers stole dynamite from a Montreal contractor in the hope that blame for the theft would be placed on some separatist group and, if so, we want to know who authorized that theft, when and how was the Solicitor General informed of it.

We want to know whether any internal disciplinary action has been taken against the officials which the Solicitor General alleges were responsible for those illegal activities. We want to know whether those files have been referred under federal statute to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford).

We have heard about information contained on computer tapes relating to the Parti Québécois. We want to know whether that information was turned over to the Solicitor General or any other member of the federal government. We want to know whether the government now has any of that information in its possession in any form.

It is important to the House of Commons and to the people of Canada to know what has been the role of the cabinet committee on security and intelligence, a committee chaired by the Prime Minister of Canada. Was information on any of these illegal activities brought to the attention of the committee or its secretary, Mr. Pitfield? We want to know what instructions or directives have been issued by that committee to federal security forces in regard to possible surveillance of political parties, in particular.

Finally, we want to know what assurances, if any, the Solicitor General has given to the McDonald commission in terms of its access to federal documents free of the use of section 42(2) of the Federal Court Act, and its right to inquire into the particular role and responsibility of ministers, including the Prime Minister, in federal security operations.

Those are some of the questions which exist in relation to the responsibility of this government for security activities which we now know have resulted in at least four illegal acts that have come to be known publicly in the last four months. There has been an attempt made at suggesting that the authority for these matters rests solely with the director general, a public servant. We want to know where the Government of Canada was throughout all of these matters, the government that is responsible to the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: We want to know why there has been an attempt to stonewall legitimate questioning by this side of the House.

An hon. Member: Even when we tell you, you do not listen.

[Mr. Clark.]

Mr. Clark: We want to know this in order to determine all of the evidence and all of the information concerning these matters. We want to know these matters as soon as possible.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Right now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, the basic facts relating to the debate tonight are as follows: as a result of information provided in the last 72 hours, we now know that there was a break-in at the Parti Québécois office on January 9, 1973.

Mr. Lalonde: No.

Mr. Broadbent: And, no doubt, it was an illegal break-in.

Mr. Lalonde: You are wrong on the place.

Mr. Broadbent: We also know that the Parti Québécois has alleged—and there is no doubt in anyone's mind—an illegal theft of dynamite and the illegal burning of a barn. These are the crude facts; but what is involved is something well beyond the crude facts. First, there is the principle of the rule of law, and that is, the principle that all citizens, including politicians and policemen, must act in accordance with the law established by the Parliament of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Second is the very important notion of ministerial responsibility, including that of the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau). This notion, ancient in the history of parliament, entails the obligation of ministers to ensure that on matters of policy and in the implementation of law they obtain the compliance of all the people within their departments, all the people for whom they are responsible. It also entails the moral obligation to inform the people of Canada in the House of Commons if and when there has been a clear breach of the law within their departments, and the obligation to ensure that all such activity is stopped forthwith once it is discovered.

What is the recent record on these two important democratic principles as administered by the current government? I will not be concerned in my comments this evening with the illegal break-in in the fall of 1972. There has been much said about that, particularly during the closing days of the session last spring. I will not be concerned about the allegations of the RCMP burning private property and stealing dynamite. I want to concentrate on the break-in at the offices of the Parti Québécois on January 9, 1973, the implications of such actions, and most particularly, the government's responsibility in this sad affair.

There can be no serious doubt now about who authorized this break-in. It was the director general of the security services at the time, Mr. John Starnes. This has been asserted by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox), although he refused to name the individual. He named the position, he did it on the telephone with me last Friday and he did it in his statement in